BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

SOME THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS IN THE WORK OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN AND THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES IN ECUMENICAL PERSPECTIVE

by

James Richard Roach

(B.S., Boston College, 1957
St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass., 1963)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1972

XUM

APPROVED

by

First Reader....Joseph C. Weber, Jr.....

Associate Professor of Ecumenics

Second Reader....J. Robert Nelson....

Professor of Systematic Theology

XUM

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have

indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

XUM

SOME THEOLOGICAL CONCEPTS IN THE THOUGHT OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN AND THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES IN ECUMENICAL PERSPECTIVE

(Order No.______)

James Richard Roach, Ph.D.
Boston University Graduate School, 1972

Major Professor: Joseph C. Weber, Associate Professor of Ecumenics

Since the First Faith and Order Conference was held at Lausanne in 1927, the Faith and Order movement has explored and evaluated many theological concepts in its quest for unity. The consistent focus throughout its studies has been Christ and the Church. A trinitarian faith has always been implicit in Faith and Order thinking, but it has been the Christocentric and ecclesial dimensions which have the center of its studies. These two themes are those most fully explored in Faith and Order documents and they have been explored in an ever-widening context.

The task of Faith and Order is to proclaim the oneness of the Church and its purpose is to promote unity among the Churches so that the world may believe. As it merged with the Life and Work Movement to form the World Council of Churches, Faith and Order broadened its context in the search for unity. Its theologians saw the pressing need of a radical revision of theological language and spoke of the re-formulation of central doctrines of Christianity as an urgent and inescapable task. At the

XUM

present time there are a number of theological questions being studied by Faith and Order theologians treating of the relation of creation, redemption, the unity of the Church and the unity of mankind. They are probing these questions in the context of the cosmic dimension of the Lordship of Christ.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, the Jesuit scientist and theologian, was also concerned with Christian unity. His vision of unity is totally dependent upon the action of Christ. It is a unity effected through the Church and embraces all mankind. His faith, too, was trinitarian although his focus was ecclesial and Christocentric. His emphasis was on the cosmic dimensions of the Lordship of Christ as he attempted to bring together an evolutionary cosmology and Christian eschatology. His theologizing from the very beginning was carried out within the same context that Faith and Order studies are presently being pursued. He studied and explored many of the same theological problems that are currently being examined by Faith and Order theologians. Recent documents in Faith and Order studies reveal the increasing influence of evolutionary thought on theological thinking. The influence of Teilhard on these studies is by no means absent and has even been considered too evident. Teilhard had early anticipated the need for a reformulation of Christian teaching. His approach was a Pauline cosmic view.

It is the purpose of this study to note the correspondences between the purpose, methodology and context of Faith and Order studies and those of Teilhard and to make a comparison of their theological views. The present studies of Faith and Order have raised a number of questions dealing with the meaning of the Incarnation apart from the Fall and sin, the relation of creation, redemption and consummation, and the problem of the unity of the Church and the unity of mankind. Teilhard explored these questions and his insights can aid Faith and Order theologians in their task. Both Teilhard and Faith and Order see the unity of mankind related intimately to the unity of the Church. Both view the Incarnation as the basis for Church unity and human unity. Both see the Scotist view of the Incarnation as a fruitful approach to explaining the cosmic dimension of Christ's Lordship.

It is hoped that this exploration of Teilhard's theology and his response to the questions raised by Faith and Order theologians can, in concert with Faith and Order studies, serve to further the search of the Churches for unity.

XUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

READERS' APPROVAL PAGE.................................. ii

ABSTRACT.. iii

Chapter

I. Chapter One: INTRODUCTION

- 1. The Problem of the Dissertation........... 1
- 2. Definitions.............................. 2
- 3. Limitations.............................. 3
- 4. Previous Research in the Field............ 4
- 5. Method of the Dissertation................ 5

II. Chapter Two: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE VISION OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

- 1. Teilhard's Vision......................... 6
  - i. Teilhard's Purpose.................... 7
  - ii. Relevance............................ 12
  - iii. Science and Religion................ 18
  - iv. Concern for Unity.................... 22
    - (1) Man and the Universe........... 25
    - (2) Truth.......................... 27
    - (3) Ecumenism...................... 29
- 2. Teilhard's Methodology.................... 32
  - i. Evolution............................. 35
  - ii. Genesis.............................. 37
  - iii. Christ.............................. 40

Chapter

3. Teilhard and Rome.......................... 42
  - i. Orthodoxy.......................... 44
  - ii. Teilhard's Acceptance............... 47

III. Chapter Three: THE SEARCH FOR UNITY: TEILHARD AND FAITH AND ORDER

1. Evolution and Unity....................... 50
  - i. Complexity-consciousness............. 51
  - ii. Cosmogenesis......................... 53
  - iii. Biogenesis.......................... 58

2. The Phenomenon of Man..................... 60
  - i. Anthropogenesis...................... 63
  - ii. Noogenesis........................... 66

3. The Christian Phenomenon.................. 72
  - i. Christogenesis....................... 74
  - ii. Union Differentiates................. 79
  - iii. Upward and Forward.................. 82

4. Faith and Order and Unity................. 87
  - i. Lausanne to Amsterdam................ 87
    - (1) Methodology...................... 99
    - (2) Widening Circumference........... 101
  - ii. Mission and Unity.................... 104
  - iii. Lordship of Christ.................. 107
  - iv. Bristol.............................. 109
  - v. Geneva............................... 113

5. Summary................................... 115
  - i. Purpose of Faith and Order........... 115

XUM

Chapter

ii. Problem.............................. 116

iii. Teilhard's Purpose.................. 118

iv. Teilhard's Viewpoint................ 120

IV. Chapter Four: THE INCARNATION: A DOCTRINE AND A VIEW

1. Teilhard and the Incarnation.............. 126
    - i. Linked to Evolution................ 128
    - ii. Linked to Creation................ 133
    - iii. Freedom and the Incarnation......... 136

2. Incarnation and Christogenesis........... 138
    - i. Christogenesis..................... 140
    - ii. Cosmic Christ..................... 142
    - iii. Historical Jesus.................. 145
        - (1) Personal Savior................ 147
        - (2) Body of Christ................. 149
    - iv. Omega............................. 152

3. Faith and Order and the Incarnation....... 155
    - i. The Decisive Act................... 163
    - ii. Motive of the Incarnation.......... 165
        - (1) Body of Christ................. 167
        - (2) Christ and the Church.......... 169
        - (3) Montreal....................... 171

4. Scotus and the Incarnation............... 175
    - i. Bristol............................ 178
    - ii. Re-creation....................... 179
    - iii. Reparation........................ 181

Chapter

iv. Secular Values........................ 183

5. Summary................................ 184

i. Question Facing Faith and Order..... 184

(1) Uppsala........................ 185

(2) Horizontal or Vertical......... 186

ii. Teilhard's Contribution............ 190

V. Chapter Five: RESURRECTION AND REDEMPTION

1. Teilhard: Resurrection and Redemption.... 197

i. Resurrection........................ 198

(1) Bodily Nature.................. 199

(2) Universal in Christ............ 201

ii. Redemption......................... 202

(1) Cosmic Character............... 202

(2) Relation to Creation........... 206

(3) Relation to Incarnation........ 208

(4) Relation to Cross.............. 210

iii. Original Sin....................... 212

iv. Freedom and Evil................... 217

v. Grace.............................. 222

(1) Body of Christ................. 223

(2) Gratuity....................... 227

(3) Hope........................... 228

(4) The Direction.................. 231

2. Faith and Order: Resurrection and Redemption.............................. 232

i. Cosmic Redemption.................. 238

XUM

Chapter

ii. Creation and Redemption............ 240
iii. Grace and Freedom................... 245
(1) Edinburgh Statement........... 247
(2) Renewal in Church and Society.. 251
3. Hope................................ 253
i. Evanston: Theme of Hope........... 255
ii. Signs of Hope...................... 261
4. Summary............................ 268
i. Question Facing Faith and Order..... 268
ii. Teilhard's Contribution............ 269

VI. Chapter Six: THE CHURCH

1. Teilhard's Concept.................... 275
i. Church and Evolution............... 278
(1) Phylum of Love................. 281
(2) Union Through Love........... 282
(3) Uniqueness.................... 284
ii. Church and Rome.................... 286
2. Role of the Church.................... 289
i. Eucharistic Community............... 289
ii. The Divine Milieu.................. 292
iii. In Christogenesis.................. 295
iv. Body of Christ..................... 297
3. Faith and Order and the Church........... 299
i. Amsterdam.......................... 302
ii. Lund: Methodology................. 304

XUM

Chapter

iii. Christology........................ 308
(1) Church Unity and Human Unity... 310
(2) The Catholicity of the Church.. 313
iv. Eschatology........................ 315
4. Summary................................ 317
i. Question Facing Faith and Order..... 317
ii. Teilhard and Vatican II............ 319
iii. Teilhard's Contribution........... 321

VII. Chapter Seven: CHRIST IN MATTER

1. Teilhard: Christ in Matter............... 326
i. Christogenesis and Cosmogenesis..... 327
ii. Creation........................... 329
iii. Incarnation....................... 331
iv. Christianity....................... 334
2. Teilhard and the Eucharist............... 336
i. Real Presence and the Body of Christ.............................. 339
ii. Extensions......................... 342
iii. Centrality........................ 345
3. Faith and Order: Creation................ 347
i. One World.......................... 351
ii. Heilsgeschichte.................... 355
4. Faith and Order: The Eucharist........... 358
i. Corporate Nature.................... 362
ii. Eucharist and Ecclesiology......... 365
iii. Bristol and Catholicity........... 367

XUM

Chapter

iv. Centrality.......................... 371

5. Summary.............................. 372

i. Question Facing Faith and Order..... 372

ii. Teilhard's Contribution............. 373

VIII. Chapter Eight: CREATION AND THE FUTURE OF MAN

1. Teilhard and Creation.................. 378

i. Evolutionary and Continuous........ 379

ii. And Human Activity................. 382

iii. Christic........................... 385

iv. Through Union...................... 386

2. Building the Earth..................... 387

i. Man's Role in Creation............. 390

ii. Building the Kingdom.............. 393

iii. Ultimate End of the Earth.......... 395

3. Parousia............................... 397

i. Parousia and the Church............ 399

ii. The New Christian.................. 400

iii. The Christian in the World......... 403

4. Faith and Order and Eschatology........ 407

i. Interest Grows..................... 410

ii. Church and World................... 414

iii. The Direction of the Future........ 418

iv. Christian in the World............. 420

(1) Responsibility to Society...... 423

(2) World Conference on Church and Society..................... 426

Chapter

5. Summary.. 429

i. Question Facing Faith and Order..... 429

ii. Teilhard's Contribution............ 430

IX. Chapter Nine: CONCLUSION.................... 435

BIBLIOGRAPHY.. 443

VITA.. 455

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation

The problem of this dissertation is to compare certain theological concepts of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, influenced as they are by his evolutionary perspective, to similar theological concepts embodied in the publications of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. For Teilhard, the reality of evolution thoroughly informed his theological outlook. It caused him to modify the perspectives of Christian theology by modifying our perspectives upon the world. He wanted to renew theology, and especially Christology, in the light of a world in evolution, a world that is dynamic and in the process of becoming. By placing Christian theology in this context, radically different from the traditional setting of a static, finished world, he hoped to revitalize Christianity and close the distance between the Church and the modern world.

Teilhard had anticipated the need to restate Christian teaching in a renewed context so that it might be more acceptable and meaningful to modern man. Faith and Order studies increasingly reveal the influence of awareness that a change in context is needed. Recent Faith and Order documents attest to the fact that the influence of Teilhard is by no means absent in Faith and Order Studies[1] and there is an attempt to probe theological questions in this wider context. As this study proceeds there will be an attempt to examine areas of divergence or convergence between the theological concepts of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and those of Faith and Order publications pointing to a common direction to foster doctrinal unity and theological understanding, to further unity among the Churches, and to reveal more clearly the unity that already exists.

2. Definitions

Teilhard wanted to recast all of theology, especially Christology, in the light of evolution. The change of perspective in no way led him to add or subtract anything essential from Christian doctrines, but allowed him to discover new and unforeseen aspects of traditional doctrine. For Teilhard the idea of "genèse" is the dimension from which all the doctrines of the Church must be reviewed in order to see them in their fulness with a relevance which fits the outlook of modern man.

---

[1] "Discussion of the Paper 'God in Nature and History'," in *New Directions in Faith and Order*, Faith and Order Paper No. 50 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 90.

He believed that Christian theology set in a dynamic evolutionary framework would provide a deeper understanding of Christian faith and an impelling motive for fostering Christian humanism. Both Teilhard and the theological statements of Faith and Order reflect the need for progress in understanding the mystery of Christ, and the need for a theology which speaks to man today. Both reflect a great concern for the Christian's task to develop the world, and for the relationship of the unity of the Church and the unity of Mankind.

3. Limitations

Teilhard was a professional scientist, a geologist and palaeontologist, world renowned for numerous scientific achievements. He produced many publications treating highly technical matters pertaining to his profession. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the scientific value of Teilhard's evolutionist views or his scientific works. These will be treated only insofar as they are necessary for an accurate understanding of his theological views. Since Teilhard has not written a treatise of systematic theology, all his pertinent writings will be surveyed for relevance. He was more interested in stimulating a climate of thought than in propagating ideas and so strongly emphasized certain theological concepts while giving much less attention to others, although from a Roman Catholic

XUM

point of view "there is no fundamental dogmatic statement that is not affirmed and maintained in its entirety."[1]

Certain crucial areas of theological thought explored by Teilhard will be analyzed and compared with similar theological concepts in Faith and Order publications. The study is further limited in that consideration will be given chiefly to Faith and Order publications covering the beginning of the Faith and Order meetings from Lausanne, 1927, up to and including the Uppsala Assembly, 1968, taking into account especially some of the important questions presently facing Faith and Order. Subsequent publications of the Faith and Order Commission relating to the areas explored will also be surveyed.

4. Previous Research in the Field

Because of the unsystematic presentation of theology in the works of Teilhard, and the refusal of his ecclesiastical superiors to allow him to publish writing of a philosophical or theological nature, works treating of his theology in a systematic fashion are only now emerging. The major portion of writings were gathered together and published between 1955-1965. There are still a few manuscripts which have not been published but they are readily available from the numerous Teilhard

---

[1] Emile Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, trans. by René Hague (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 188.

Associations which were formed after his death. To the writer's knowledge, there have been no studies at all comparing Teilhard's theology with those of the Faith and Order Commission with a view towards convergence and a concern for furthering Church unity.

5. Method of the Dissertation

The problem will be explored in three stages. Primary emphasis will be given to an explication of Teilhard's theological views in keeping with his evolutionary viewpoint, because he was not a professional theologian and did not provide systematic presentations of his theological thought; then there will be an explication of the views expressed in the documents of Faith and Order relating to the same areas of theological concern, showing that both Faith and Order and Teilhard have pursued common problems in a similar context; and finally, a summary of analysis and evaluation of the two views with an attempt to establish points of correspondence and convergence and to determine directions which when pursued might lead to greater understanding and unity in these areas. This summary will have as its special point of reference a number of the questions formulated by the Faith and Order Commission in its theological publications and presently being studied by theologians.

CHAPTER II

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE VISION OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

1. Teilhard's Vision

If there is any person who is central to the life of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, then that person is Jesus Christ. He is the dominant figure of most of the theological writings of Teilhard. And if there is a dominant theme which works its way through all of the writings of Teilhard, then this theme is evolution. It was the lifelong task and pursuit of Teilhard to bring these two themes together in a conjunction which he hoped would bring a sense of purpose and of hope to modern man. Three days before he died Teilhard wrote in the last page of his journal his supreme testimony as a scientist, a thinker and a priest. This reveals in outline form the joining of both the theme of the theory of evolution and the place of Christ in the thought of Teilhard:

> LAST PAGE OF THE JOURNAL OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN
>
> Maundy Thursday. What I believe.
>
> 1. St. Paul - the three verses: En pasi panta Theos.
> 2. Cosmos = Cosmogenesis-Biogenesis-Noogenesis-Christogenesis.

3. The Universe is centrated - Evolutively Upward
Forward

The Christian Phenomenon

The two articles of my Credo
Christ is its Centre
Noogenesis=Christogenesis (=Paul)

> The three verses are I Corinthians XV, 26, 27 and 28:
> The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.
> For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.
> And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.[1]

Evolution was in a certain sense central to Teilhard. It was a phenomenon which was common to everything in the past, present and the future. It was a phenomenon to which the heavens and the earth, animate life, inanimate objects, past, present and future society itself were subject. It was the key to understanding life. It was, for Teilhard, moreover, a source of faith--faith in God, and faith in the world.

i. Teilhard's Purpose

Teilhard's purpose could probably be best summed up very simply by the phrase that he used on the last page of his journal, "that God may be all in all." (I Cor. 15:28) In his most comprehensive work on modern spirituality,

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, The Future of Man, trans. by Norman Denny (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 309.

XUM

Teilhard states his purpose: "To teach how to see God everywhere, to see him in all that was most hidden, most solid, and most ultimate in the world."[1] He thought of himself as a man trying to express frankly what lies at the heart of his generation. And for Teilhard the generation of which he was a part was a generation which was subject to much unbelief. It was to help overcome modern unbelief that Teilhard spoke of Christ and of Christianity in terms that were meaningful and significant to modern man. Teilhard believed that the modern world is not radically unbelieving or radically non-religious, but rather, "its natural capacity for worship is now diverted to an object, the universe, which _seems_ to be in opposition to the Christian God."[2] Teilhard believed that within a few generations mankind had been converted to a sort of "religion of the world,"[3] which religion was clear in its moral orientation, the recognition of the primacy of the whole over the individual, faith in the potentialities of human effort and an appreciation of research.[4] Teilhard is critical of Christianity, which he believes has given the impression of having escaped or resisted this psychological revolution. He sees the Church as fearing progress and discovery and neglecting to magnify or to approve the loftiest aspirations of modern man. This, he says, is the outward impression. Those who are Christians know that this is deceptive, but it appears this way to those who are outside of Christianity. And he believes that the "gentiles," a term which he applies to those who are not Christians, turn away from a Gospel that appears to them to be alien to their outlook on the world and which fails to meet their questions and their expectations. Teilhard believes that modern man under the view of evolution and progress is able to recognize God "only in the continuation...of some universal progress or maturing."[1] Teilhard believes that the curative for modern unbelief is "to make it clear that the universe, as it now presents itself to our investigations, is far from eclipsing the Christian God: it is simply waiting to be transfigured by Him and receive Him as its crown."[2]

---

[1] Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, _The Divine Milieu_ (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 15.

[2] Teilhard, "Modern Unbelief," in _Science and Christ_, trans. by René Hague (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 113.

[3] Teilhard, _ibid_., p. 114.

[4] _Ibid_. p. 115.

For Teilhard, "only Christ, in quo omnia constant, is capable of animating and guiding the newly sensed progress of the universe..."[3] So Teilhard was supremely apologetic. The real interest in his life was, as he stated, "a plainer disclosing of God in the world... ...it's my only true vocation."[1] Henri de Lubac, friend of Teilhard, and perhaps his most competent interpreter, compares him to some of the great missionaries in the Jesuit tradition, such as Matteo Ricci and Roberto di Nobili and says, "Just as they wanted to win distant civilizations for Christ, so he wanted to win this new continent, the modern world of science."[2] So for Teilhard, his mission was not to go to far distant lands to preach the Gospel to those who had not heard of it, but rather his mission "is to assume (in duere) the religious spirit of the modern world, in its natural fullness, and to live it, fully and sincerely, on the Christian plane."[3]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid., p. 116

[3] Ibid., p. 117.

Teilhard was not a systematic theologian, and de Lubac warns us that "we should not look to Pere Teilhard for a complete course in theology..."[4] Teilhard recognized this himself when early in his career he said, "The somewhat hazardous or oversystematized points in my doctrine are in fact of only secondary importance to

---

[1] Teilhard, Letters From a Traveller, trans. by (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 119.

[2] Henri de Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, trans. by René Hague (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1962), p. 273.

[3] Teilhard, "Modern Unbelief," in Science and Christ, p. 116.

[4] Lubac, ibid., p. 139.

XUM

me. It is not nearly so much ideas that I want to spread abroad as a spirit."[1] Yet as time went on and his scientific career developed, it became more and more evident that Teilhard's thoughts became more and more systematized. This systematization, in fact, has led to some trenchant criticisms of his total work. So although Teilhard was initially concerned with spreading the spirit of science, of openness, and of belief abroad, nevertheless Dyson makes the comment that, "His life-task, in which he was at once most revolutionary and most vulnerable, consisted in structuring (in a provisional but detailed way) a synthesized mode of thought by which man may be seen and understood as a unity, as a child of heaven and of earth."[2]

Teilhard's purpose, then, was to set Christian theologians on a course which would allow both for openness to science and fundamental Christian belief. "It is as prophet that he points towards the solution of the problem...how to reconcile *Ecclesia quaerens* with *Ecclesia docens*..."[3] Teilhard as a scientist saw

---

[1] Teilhard, *The Making of a Mind*, (London: William Collins Sons and Co., Ltd., 1965), p. 247.

[2] A. O. Dyson, "Pierre Teilhard de Chardin," in *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, ed. by Alan Richardson (London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 332-334.

[3] Anthony Hanson, "Ecclesia Quaerens," in *Teilhard Reassessed*, ed. by A. Hanson (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970), p. 177.

XUM

evolution as a curve which illumines all of reality. And as a Christian apologist he saw the Christian faith, not as a fortress to be guarded and defended, but as a light to illumine whatever history and the future may have in store for us.

ii. Relevance

There was in the beginning of the discovery of evolution a strong opposition by many churchmen who saw in this theory forces inimical to the Christian message and to God's revelation. In the present time the theory of evolution is now generally accepted. Teilhard believed, "The whole psychology of modern disquiet is linked with the sudden confrontation with space-time."[1] McMahon believes that there are several reasons why Teilhard remains permanently valuable, and the fact that he takes time seriously is the foremost of these.[2] Most people today have no opposition to the theory of evolution. The question remains what this theory means for Christianity. For Teilhard, "Evolution is a light illumining all facts, a curve that all lines must follow."[3] And as a scientist he lived and moved in this milieu and with this outlook. But Teilhard was a Catholic and a Jesuit priest as well as a scientist, and so he was led to say, "I couldn't help thinking of the abyss that divides the intellectual world I was in and whose language I knew, from the theological world of Rome with whose idiom I am also familiar."[1] He found a few friends who were understanding of his position, but more perhaps who were not. What Teilhard saw as "modern" was to many of his contemporaries incomprehensible. He says in The Phenomenon of Man:

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, trans. by Bernard Wall (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 227.

[2] J. McMahon, "What Does Christianity Add to Atheistic Humanism?," Cross Currents, XVIII (September, 1968), 129-150.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 218.

> What makes and classifies a 'modern' man (and a whole host of our contemporaries as not yet 'modern' in this sense) is having become capable of seeing in terms not of space and time alone, but also of duration, or--and it comes to the same thing--of biological space-time; and above all having become incapable of seeing anything otherwise--anything--not even himself.[2]

It is difficult for modern man to understand or to think in terms of biological space-time, because the adjective "biological" added to the generally accepted understanding of the usual phrase of "space-time" implies a direction which Einsteinian space-time lacks. Such a direction is disputed by some. For Teilhard, evolution has a direction, and both intelligence and thought are a product of the evolutionary force.

The task of Teilhard was to form a synthesis between the spirit of our age and Christianity. It can be seen early in his writings that he recognizes the necessity of reconciling Christianity and the pursuit of progress. He is concerned to speak with modern man. He wants to spread the message of Christ. He desires to understand Christ better, to bring Christ to realization as the center of the universe, and to recast all of theology in the light of his principle of evolution, in order to bring about these understandings. His vision was a vision of reality in terms of becoming.

---

[1] Teilhard, Letters From a Traveller, p. 127.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 218.

Teilhard was fully aware that for contemporary man theological language presents many difficulties and in many cases has become completely unintelligible. And yet he was convinced that it was only a deeper exploration of traditional theology which would offer the solution and the renewal which were needed. Wildiers says that the core of his thought is concerned primarily with God and the universe.[1]

Teilhard sought to discover a unity in the cosmos and a unity in all of man's actions which would speak to the man of today. He sought an orientation that would be focused upon God and the world. Many of the terms of Roman Catholic theology and the forms in which it was expressed came into being under scholastic philosophy

---

[1] N. M. Wildiers, An Introduction to Teilhard de Chardin, trans. by Hubert Hoskins (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 21.

XUM

and in a world view which was static. By transposing Catholic doctrine into terms borrowed from the science of today, Teilhard attempted to make Christianity, and access to it, more intelligible for many people. But there is no doubt that the very language itself, the language of science and the natural sciences is not without its dangers.

Wildiers believes that any man who has himself experienced tension between modern culture and belief in God, or between admiration for what science has accomplished and the ideals of the Gospel, or between hopes that are based on this world and hopes centered on the next will feel himself "almost instinctively drawn to Teilhard de Chardin, will recognize in him a fellow traveller and will read in his writings a wealth of insights that can prove of major importance in helping to resolve his inner conflict."[1] Teilhard wanted to speak to modern man about his modern world, a world which is characterized by "universalism," where "society is not fixed, but developmental," where "the reality of structures is change," a world which is characterized "finally, by humanism." A world which "centers on Man."[2]

---

[1] Wildiers, ibid., p. 33.

[2] Thomas Berry, C.P., "The Threshold of the Modern World," in Proceedings of the Teilhard Conference 1964 (New York: Human Energetics Research Institute, 1964), 57-70.

In the view of Teilhard, evolution was not merely a scientific hypothesis, it was a true reality which profoundly entered into his vision of reality. Teilhard believed the most serious revolution which has happened in our knowledge of the world and our knowledge of ourselves, is the revolution which replaced fixity by evolution. He believed it was "much greater than the revolution in astronomy at the time of Galileo."[1] He believed it would be disastrous to ignore the problems presented to our faith by a universe which every day grows larger and larger through the insight of contemporary astronomy. Teilhard wanted to show that the faith he had in the religion in which he believed, was in no way destroyed or superceded by the new hopes engendered by science. "A religion which is judged inferior to a human ideal is a lost religion."[2] It was because of this that he tried to penetrate to the very core of the human ideal. And he believed that he had to proclaim in the face of the human ideal, that Christianity had to preserve all its value, and that it was possible for it to integrate this human ideal and magnify it to unforeseen limits. Teilhard wanted to supply proof to the world of the complete convergence of the universe to God through

---

[1] Teilhard, "Man's Place in Nature," in The Vision of the Past, trans. by J. M. Cohen (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 176.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 126.

Jesus Christ. He believed science was not simply the desire for knowledge or for the extension of man's powers. For Teilhard, science aspired to take charge of humanity and the future of the world. And he believed that science, instead of attaching the advance of things to a higher pole of the spirit, had little room for such a view. As Teilhard says, he believed the mystique of science has strayed into the worship of matter, and that Christian theologians had to address themselves to the problem. Teilhard's "work is full of warnings that the theologians of his own tradition were ignoring huge areas of knowledge which they ought to be considering."[1] He saw the gap between science and progress and Christianity widening, and he believed it indispensable that there should be a remedy for such a split. He himself was a brilliant pioneer of the Ecclesia quaerens, which he demanded. His method was to take Christian theology out of its Aristotelian, static context and show that the new law of universal evolution was in no way opposed to faith. He believed that an advance forward in progress in the world cannot be made without faith, and this faith can only be Christianity. In "Social Heredity and Education," he wrote: "By definition and in essence Christianity is the religion of the Incarnation: God uniting Himself with the world which he created, to unify it and in some

---

[1] Hanson, ibid., p. 158.

XUM

sort incorporate it in Himself."[1] Teilhard realized perceptively the depth and the extent of the conflict between traditional theology and the new vision of the world, and he searched with fervor for a solution. His work is timely but unfinished. He has planted a marker and has given direction to the reconciliation of a modern view of the world and Christianity.

iii. Science and Religion

Albert Einstein, writing in his later years, said, "Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind."[2] Teilhard would certainly agree with this estimation. He was both scientist and believer, and used two sources in his perspective. The first source was Christian revelation, the other source was the phenomenon of evolution. Because he uses these two sources, he has been charged by some with confusing them, or with reducing one to the other. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no attempt at all at a concordism which would mix and confuse the facts known through the scientific method and the facts of revelation.

In one of his last essays before his death, Teilhard spoke of "The marvelous and liberating harmony between a religion which is Christ-centered and an evolution which is convergent."[1] But it was the harmony between the two and not their identification or dependence which he wanted to reveal. Thirty years before this essay, he wrote: "Far be it from me to think of deducing Christian dogmas from a mere inspection of those qualities which, according to the light of reason, characterize the structure of the world."[2] The purpose of Teilhard always was to show contemporary man the meaningfulness of Christianity. He believed that the man of the twentieth century is looking for something to give meaning to his activities and to give meaning and value to the world.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," in The Future of Man, p. 33.

[2] Albert Einstein, Out of My Later Years (Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Co.), 1967, p. 25.

When he set out to write what is perhaps his best-known work, The Phenomenon of Man, he realized that to write a book which would include man as a phenomenon would be to invite criticism. He said, "I shall have the pure scientists against me as well as the experts in pure metaphysics."[3] And in this assertion he was quite correct, although perhaps they were not as violent in their opposition as he may have expected them to be. Teilhard himself was critical of those who would confuse the plane of the real, or those who would make Christ a physical agent of the same order as organic life. He clearly distinguished between the two spheres of revelation and of reason, of that which is taught and that which is discovered. And he has respect for the two entities of faith and of science, as he reveals in the preface to The Phenomenon of Man:

---

[1] Teilhard, "Le Christique," (unpublished essay, Library of the American Teilhard de Chardin Society, New York City, 1955), p. 9.

[2] Teilhard, Science and Christ, pp. 59-60.

[3] Teilhard, Letters from a Traveller, p. 263.

> If this book is to be properly understood, it must be read not as a work on metaphysics, still less as a sort of theological essay, but purely and simply as a scientific treatise. The title itself indicates that. This book deals with man solely as a phenomenon; but it also deals with the whole phenomenon of man.[1]

As Henri de Lubac remarked, "It is a perfectly clear warning that there are two parts to his work: they are distinguished by their aim and in consequence by their method."[2]

This concern of Teilhard not to confuse the data of revelation with the data of science is not confined to The Phenomenon of Man alone. His writings form a whole "in a way that those of few other thinkers do,"[3] and:

> One can, roughly speaking, divide them into two parts. The first, in which the line of thought is still scientific or, one might prefer to say, philosophical, is developed from the data of experimental science: the second, more strictly mystical and religious, is often explicitly based on the data of Christian revelation. Central to the first is The Phenomenon of Man, to the second

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, preface, p. 29.

[2] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard, p. 82.

[3] Lubac, ibid., p. 13.

XUM

Le Milieu Divin.[1]

Teilhard believes that divine revelation completes the work sketched out by reason. And so he adds an epilogue at the end of The Phenomenon of Man, entitled, "The Christian Phenomenon." Teilhard again takes up the charge that he confuses the two categories of science and religion and says in answer,

> Concordism must not be confused with coherence. Religion and science obviously represent two different meridians on the sphere of our minds, and it would be wrong not to keep them separate (which is the concordist error). But these meridians must necessarily meet somewhere at a pole of common measure (which is the meaning of coherence).[2]

And Christopher Mooney, after a detailed analysis of the theology of Teilhard, and a reconstruction of this theology in his book, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, concludes:

> Consequently there is no attempt whatsoever at a facile concordism which would confuse these two sources of knowledge, either deducing God's plan of salvation from purely natural reasoning, or finding in the data of Christian revelation a scientific explanation of the world.[3]

Teilhard believed, not in the opposition of science and religion, but in the fact that they are two sides of a single, perfect act of knowledge. The historical person, Jesus of Nazareth, in his Incarnation, produced a new order. The Incarnation of Christ is the consummation of the world. What Teilhard tries to do is to take Christ out of the narrow historic frame into which he has been placed and project him into the universe where he will become the true perfector of evolution, so that to follow Christ is not to flee the world, but to perfect it. In placing Christ at the center of the evolutionary process, Teilhard necessarily becomes involved with both science and religion. As deLubac points out:

---

[1] Lubac, ibid., pp. 13-14.

[2] Teilhard, "La Pensée du Père Teilhard de Chardin," Les Etudes Philosophiques, X (1955), 581.

[3] Christopher Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 59.

> He continually endeavored, sometimes with more success, sometimes with less, to bring the two together without confusing one with the other; and it is in fact a transition from one to the other that raises the nicest problems in interpretation.[1]

Some of these problems will be considered further on in this paper.

iv. Concern for Unity

There is very little doubt that by viewing the bibliography of the works of Teilhard, the problems are seen to be exceedingly diversified. The intellectual accomplishments of Teilhard are many. He was a recognized expert and professional in the fields of paleontology and geology, and wrote a number of authoritative studies in these fields. The discovery of the Peking man in China

---

[1] Lubac, *ibid*., p. 14.

XUM

and Teilhard's part in this discovery assure him of a place among the scientists. His many essays and articles opened up areas of discussion and produced new insights into the varied problems of philosophy, theology and other sciences. But still, "there is an organic unity that can be found in his works. There are some few ideas which are central and which dominate his thought."[1]

Central to this corpus of Teilhard's works is the idea of unity itself. Teilhard was totally involved with the great and perennial problem, that of the One and the Many.[2] And he joined his talents with vigor to "...the instinctive tenacity with which man's thought tries to reduce the world to unity."[3] Speaking of Teilhard's particular concern, Mooney says:

> Reduced to its simplest terms, it was the discontinuity he experienced between love of God and love of the world, between human achievement and the kingdom of Christ, between Christian detachment and personal self-development, between the data of revelation and scientific research. Hence the whole movement of his thought was a continuous search for unity...This is his fundamental preoccupation, the leit-motif of his life.[4]

And although he was aware of the distinctions between the disciplines and respected the differing methodologies, yet, "he was equally resolute in refusing to allow them to stand in isolation that destroys the unity of man. It was for this reason that he added an epilogue to The Phenomenon of Man."[1]

---

[1] N. M. Wildiers, An Introduction to Teilhard, p. 21.

[2] Teilhard, "Sketch of a Personalistic Universe," in Human Energy, trans. by J. M. Cohen (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1969).

[3] Teilhard, "Centrology," in Activation of Energy, trans. by René Hague (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), p. 99.

[4] Mooney, ibid., p. 13.

Teilhard was the great apostle of unity. While he in no way would attempt to impose one methodology upon another, yet he felt that there was no opposition between science and religion. He believed in the two realms of faith and of science. He believed in the unity of truth, that truth could not contradict itself, and that various truths were complementary: "The multiplicity of evolutions into which the world process seems to us to be split up is in fact fundamentally the working out of one single great mystery."[2] The guiding feature for Teilhard was the central role of Christ and of the Church in the unity of all creation. In The Phenomenon of Man, Teilhard sets out to establish a unity among the cosmos and life and man and thought. He begins from the genesis of a cosmos and develops his ideas of "cosmogenesis" up through "noogenesis." But he saw all of humanity in the light of Christ. He believed in the centrality of Christ, and his whole life was spent in the attempt to make Christ better known. And so in his theological attempts, he tries: "to construct a theology, or more accurately a Christology (that is to say, a reflection upon the data of revelation regarding the Person of Christ), in which he can postulate a connection between this natural process and the supernatural consummation of mankind."[1]

---

[1] Lubac, ibid., p. 87.

[2] Teilhard, "The Pyx," in Hymn of the Universe (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 50.

(1) Man and the Universe

While Teilhard wanted to highlight and place in strong relief the centrality of Christ within all of creation, at the same time he wanted to restore man to his rightful place in the universe. Ever since the Copernican revolution, man seemed to have lost his place as the center of all creation. Teilhard believed that by placing man at the center of the cosmos as the final product of evolution, he would return man to a central place. In his evolutionary perspective, Teilhard saw man as the culmination of evolution. He saw man as evolution become conscious of itself. He was occupied in building a world in which man will be the key and not an anomaly, "a general presentation of a sort of spiritual cosmogony--but not a metaphysic --of the person."[2]

And such a construction for Teilhard had to begin from physics and chemistry, for "Man can be understood only by

---

[1] Mooney, ibid., p. 61.

[2] Teilhard, Letters From a Traveller, p. 159.

XUM

ascending from physics, chemistry, biology, and theology: in other words, as first of all a cosmic problem."[1] So Teilhard was to see man as emerging at the end of a long process of evolution. He saw man coming to being as soon as reflection appeared in the world. Man, for Teilhard, was distinct from all other creatures by his ability to reflect, and this ability to reflect, Teilhard felt, needed to be understood within the total phenomenon in order that the interpretation of the universe be satisfactory. As a scientist, he could not accept merely a study of the external phenomenon in the world. For him, man was unique because he was a reflective being, and it was essential that this element of reflection be studied scientifically. Teilhard says in The Phenomenon of Man:

> The time has come to realize that an interpretation of the universe--even a positivist one--remains unsatisfying unless it covers the within as well as the exterior of things--mind as well as matter.[2]

He believed that human reflection "is not an epiphenomenon of the organic world, but the central phenomenon of vitalization."[3]

Teilhard believed that by presenting man as the

---

[1] Letter of September 21, 1952, in Claude Cuénot, Teilhard de Chardin, trans. by Vincent Colimore (Baltimore: Helicon, 1965), p. 350.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, pp. 35-36.

[3] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis," in The Future of Man, p. 218.

XUM

terminus of evolution he would be meaningful to men today, and only by viewing man as part of God's creation and as a recipient of the redemption of Jesus Christ would he be thoroughly meaningful.

> And it is thus, in the end, that above the rediscovered greatness of man, above the revealed greatness of humanity, not violating but preserving the integrity of science, the face of God reappears in our universe.[1]

It was, then, to reveal the face of God in the universe that Teilhard sets man in the center of the cosmic process. He maintains the distinction between the methodology of science and that of revelation but nonetheless his approach is an apologetic one. It is an approach which serves what he called his "noble cause," which is the fusion of Christian life with the life of the universe, which has culminated in man.

(2) Truth

Teilhard had no reservations at all about the apologetic character of his writing. Among his many essays, there is an entire series which has a directly apologetic character. And in The Divine Milieu, he shows:

> ...one of the first apologetic duties of the Christian is to show, by the logic of his religious views and still more by the logic of his action, that the Incarnate God did not come to diminish the magnificent responsibility and splendid ambition that is ours: of becoming

---

[1] Teilhard, Man's Place in the Universe," in The Vision of the Past, p. 231.

XUM

our own self. Once again, non minuit, sed sacravit.[1] Yet Teilhard makes no claim to establish any general system of apologetics. He makes this explicit in the opening page of "My Universe."[2] He claims that what he wants to do is to explain how he understands the world personally, a world to which he has been progressively more fully introduced by the developing consciousness of himself as a man and a Christian.

He recognizes that his views will be open to criticism, but that they will not be able to rob his thought of its special value, that of an incontestable psychological witness. He believes that one fact will remain unchallenged, that is, that he could not find a proper balance for his interior life except in the unitary concept based upon physics of the world and of Christ. Within this view of the world he has found peace and room for personal development. For Teilhard, then, his apologetic is not systematic in nature, but is rather personal in presentation. Teilhard with his scientific competence and his Christian faith was bearing witness to a truth as he saw it. And he believed, "It is enough for the truth to appear one single time, in one single mind, for it to be impossible for anything to prevent it from spreading universally and setting all ablaze."[1] So Teilhard believed if his vision were true, then it would stand. If not, then it would be replaced. He was willing to accept criticism of his views and to amend them. At times he explicitly sought evaluation of some particular views in order that he might further clarify his own thinking on it. He did this especially with regard to the nature of original sin. He worked constantly throughout his life modifying his views and sharpening his focus. But he proceeded with faith in the world and faith in Christ, confident that the truth in both areas would vindicate his vision.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 37.

[2] Teilhard, Science and Christ, p. 37.

(3) Ecumenism

While Teilhard worked in a milieu which certainly can be said to be ecumenical, it was true that he seldom concerned himself with the ecumenical movement as we know it today. In 1946, he published a short essay entitled, "Ecumenism," and in this sketched out in broad detail what he would consider necessary for ecumenism to flourish. Here, he treats ecumenism as he does almost every other phase of that to which he gives his thought. That is, he treats it universally. He believes that a form of ecumenism is attempting to assert itself today and that "it will certainly come,"[1] but he is not certain about the practical form such an ecumenism will take. He believes that at the present time, the great mystical religious currents of east and west are contrary as they are presently set forth. He views the Eastern religions as a current in which "God, in whom the elements and determinations of the world are dissolved," and the Western Christian current "in which a God of tension and love is seen as the consummation of all personalization and all determination..." as fundamentally irreconcilable in their present formulation.[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Le Christique," p. 15.

But he also rejects syncretism and sees the difficulty of a convergence of a religion which is syncretistic with a religion around which there is a Christ who cannot be measured with any prophet or any Buddha. He sees also a difficulty between Christians themselves according to whether or not they accept or reject a certain faith in man at the root of their religious faith. For Teilhard a true ecumenism would be between what he calls "summit ecumenism" and "basal ecumenism."[3] By "summit ecumenism," he means those Christians who are concerned to bring out an orthodox and human Christianity on a cosmic scale, and by "basal

---

[1] Teilhard, Science and Christ, p. 197.

[2] Teilhard, "Ecumenism," in Science and Christ, p. 197.

[3] Ibid., p. 198.

XUM

ecumenism," he speaks of those men in general who want to extend and to define the foundations of faith in the future of mankind. He says, "Combined, these two efforts would automatically lead us to the ecumenism we are waiting for..."[1] He posits these two ecumenisms in combination because he believes that without a fully explicit Christ, a faith in mankind cannot be satisfied.

Although Teilhard did not address himself directly to the ecumenical movement, he did nonetheless contribute to an atmosphere that could enhance the ecumenical perspective, so one could speak of "his fundamental, albeit indirect, contributions to ecumenism."[2] Or even that "The ecumenical movement is "Teilhardian in character."[3] Father Donald Campion, in his commentary on the pastoral constitution, The Church in the Modern World, says, "Here, as elsewhere, it is easy to recognize the compatibility of insights developed by thinkers such as Teilhard de Chardin in his Divine Milieu...with the fundamental outlook of the Council."[4] And Hendrikus

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ralph Wayne Kraft, The Relevance of Teilhard (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1968), p. 29.

[3] Bernard Towers, Teilhard de Chardin (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1966), p. 37.

[4] Donald R. Campion, Commentary on "The Church in the Modern World," in The Documents of Vatican II, edited by Walter M. Abbott, S.J., (New York: Guild Press, 1966), pp. 269-270.

Berkhof, speaking on the finality of Jesus Christ, has said:

> It is especially this inclusiveness of the Christ-event which came home to us Christians in recent decades. We may think here of Karl Barth and of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, of the Pastoral Constitution of Vatican II 'Gaudium et Spes'...[1]

So although Teilhard was not involved in ecumenical activities per se, his whole life was ecumenical in outlook and his far-reaching thought and vision certainly pointed in a direction in which the ecumenical movement is presently concerned: faith in Christ and faith in the world.

2. Teilhard's Methodology

Teilhard believed that modern man, because of technology and science, was turning away from the worship of God to the worship of the world. He believed that this current was religious, but was misdirected, and his life's work, then, was to reach the modern religious current at its most profound level, and then to change its course. If he were to do this, he believed three steps would be necessary, each one linked to the other. In his essay, "Some reflections on the Conversion of the World," Teilhard said the first step, "would consist in developing...a correct physics and metaphysics of evolution."[1] His view was that evolution does not lead to materialistic evolution, but rather an evolution in terms of spirit. He also believed that evolution is not haphazard, but is oriented and directed towards a personal center of universal convergence.

---

[1] Hendrikus Berkhof, "The Finality of Jesus Christ," in The Uppsala Report, edited by Norman Goodall (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 307.

The second step for Teilhard concerns dogmatic theology, and this would "consist in formulating a Christology proportionate to the dimensions now attributed to the universe."[2] Teilhard stresses in his dogmatic theology the cosmic attributes of Christ, especially in keeping with the thought of St. Paul. It was these cosmic attributes that make Christ the personal center of evolution. Teilhard believed that this was also in keeping with the theology of some of the Greek Fathers.

The third step for Teilhard is that of "developing a gospel of human conquest."[3] For Teilhard, Christ will come again after the completion of the world, which, as he says, is "much larger and more unfinished than we used to think."[4] Teilhard believed that Christians must disclose more clearly than they have done, the supernatural value of human effort in Christ Jesus.

Teilhard is at pains to point out that this is in no way a compromise between Christianity and the modern world. For Christ dominates the universe and assimilates it to himself. This domination is effected because Christ imposes upon the world "the personal nature of the Divine; the manifestation of this supreme personality in the historical Christ; the super-terrestrial nature of the world consummated in God."[1] For Teilhard, this is "simply the notion of the Mystical Body, taken in its fullest and most profound sense..."[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, Science and Christ, p. 122.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Teilhard, ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 123.

This, then, is the methodology which will guide Teilhard's thinking and his approach to a worldview, for "Teilhard saw things in their potentialities, orientations and preadaptations."[3] His view is always of the cosmic and universal. For Teilhard God is Alpha. He was at the beginning of everything. Teilhard, however, does not develop this point, leaving this to the professional philosophers and theologians. He concerns himself with the study of God as Omega, the end of all things.

For Teilhard, the constant direction was to a God who would be all in all, and in whom everything stands.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 124

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] W. Donnelly, "The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin," *Clergy Review*, XLV (June, 1960), p. 335.

XUM

(1) Evolution

In The Phenomenon of Man, Teilhard says:

> Is evolution a theory, a system or a hypothesis? It is much more: it is a general condition to which all theories, all hypotheses, all systems must bow...Evolution is a light illuminating all facts, a curve that all lines must follow.[1]

Teilhard believed that evolution is not only a fact but that it has a direction. Moreover, it was really "an experimental affirmation of the coherence of being."[2] Evolution, he affirmed, has a direction, and the higher the degree of complexity of an organism, the correspondingly higher degree of consciousness. The key concept of Teilhard is his law of consciousness and complexity, the law which allows him to see that "the stuff of the universe, woven in a single piece according to one and the same system, but never repeating itself from one point to another, represents a simple figure."[3] This law of complexity-consciousness states that there is a tendency in evolution for matter to become more and more complex in its organization. With this increase of material complexity, there is a corresponding rise in consciousness. Consciousness is not something which is injected into matter, but is one of its fundamental properties. There is an internal urge in matter to unite, and this internal urge leads to complexification, and therefore to greater consciousness.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 218.

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 38.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 45.

This theory of Teilhard gives to the universe a direction and a structure. Evolution is tending towards consciousness, and therefore towards man. Evolution, in tending towards consciousness, is then tending at the same time towards the personal, and therefore towards a center. For Teilhard the fundamental discovery that all bodies owe their origin to arrangements such as this is the light that illumines the history of the universe to man. And he says, "From its most distant formulations matter reveals itself to us in a state of genesis or becoming."[1] Teilhard believes that from the basic elements in the cosmos, one can perceive the process of genesis. From cosmogenesis there came life, biogenesis. From biogenesis there arose anthropogenesis, as man appeared on the scene, and then there emerged thought, which is noogenesis. This discovery of the evolutionary phenomenon has made profound impressions upon the man of today. As Teilhard says, "What has made us in four or five generations so different from our forebears...is not merely that we have discovered and mastered other forms of nature...it is that we have become conscious of the movement which is carrying us along."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 49.

ii. Genesis

The movement, then, according to Teilhard, has not stopped, but is still continuing. What Teilhard wants to do is to see the world under the aspect of 'genèse,' and Mooney reminds us that 'genèse' is much wider in meaning and more common in usage than the English, 'genesis.' It applies to any form of production involving successive stages oriented toward some goal."[2] For Teilhard, the goal of evolution is man and thought. "A world that is being born instead of a world that is: that is what the phenomenon of man suggests, indeed compels us to accept, if we are to find a place for man in this process of evolution in which we are obliged to make room for him."[3]

So then in Teilhard's mind, we are not facing change in the world, but we are confronted with genesis, which is something quite different. It is seen that "the vast majority would regard it as highly probable that all organic species are descended from one or a few very primitive types. Many would hold that life

---

[1] Ibid., p. 215

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 51.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 271.

XUM

originated spontaneously from non-living matter at some time in the remote past."[1] And further, "...there is no doubt that at the present time the cosmic context of philosophy is changing from a 'steady-state' to an evolving universe."[2] And again, "...the highly unified, universally interrelated structure of the modern scientific universe provides a possible ground for world finality or cosmic pattern..."[3] This finality is very much the concern of Teilhard. In seeing all of reality in the light of 'genèse,' he believes there exists a definite direction to evolution, and there is progress on a particular axis. It appears as a clear line of progress. From one stratum to another, there is development and transition, a continual pressing forward in the same direction. The ascent is from the cosmos to life to man. According to Teilhard, in the forward urge of evolution, at one time man shot like an arrow out of a conglomeration of creatures. He appeared silently and suddenly, the most mysterious of beings and a disrupting being. In an external way, he could scarcely be distinguished from his progenitors. Physically, he looked like every other species, but internally there had been a revolution. There had been a convulsion on a planetary scale. Man not only looked around, but he looked into himself. He was conscious of himself as knowing. Man was a personality and he was something new. He used implements, he made fire, and he buried his dead. Man then is not just a new branch or an accidental addition to life. The human species is really an arrow leading the whole of the biosphere. Man is the peak toward which all biological efforts have been aiming. He is the spearhead of evolution. He is the flower of the evolutionary process. For Teilhard, creation was merely a preparation for man, making his existence possible. It is man who gives significance to everything that is in the universe.

---

[1] J. L. Russel, "Teilhard de Chardin: the phenomenon of man," Heythrop Journal, I (October, 1960), pp. 275-276.

[2] Ibid., p. 275.

[3] Ibid., p. 278.

Teilhard's concept of evolution is far more extensive than that of Darwin. Darwin postulated only a transformation of zoological species. For Teilhard, this transformation represented an absolute interconnection of all existence and of the cosmos. From the beginning of life up and to including mankind, according to Teilhard, the aim of evolution was thought. But evolution has not stopped with the accomplishment of thought. Through an increase of complexity and of consciousness, man will still become more intensely man. According to Teilhard, the whole of cosmogenesis and biogenesis has no meaning without man; therefore, man must reach his goal.

iii. Christ

After many years' reflection on Christ and evolution, Teilhard wrote in 1954: "It is impossible to think of Christ as 'evolver' without at the same time having to rethink the whole of Christology."[1] And so Teilhard proposed the principle of "genèse" as an essential element in his theological view. Again, his major concern was unity. He said, "Creation, spirit, evil, God (and more specifically, original sin, the Cross, the Resurrection, the Parousia, charity...), all these ideas, transferred to the dimension of "genesis," become coherent and clear in a way which is astounding."[2] Teilhard's theological method is pinpointed accurately by Mooney when he says, "...ultimately what Teilhard wants to do in the realm of theology is to rethink the total mystery of Christ in terms of *genèse*."[3] It was a method which would enable man to "...illumine and *carry further* the genesis of the Universe around him in the form of a Christogenesis."[4] Teilhard saw this as a legitimate application of his

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Stuff of the Universe," in *Activation of Energy*, p. 382.

[2] Teilhard, letter of January 1, 1951, in *Teilhard de Chardin*, by Claude Cuenot, p. 273.

[3] Mooney, *Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ*, p. 62.

[4] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis?" in *The Future of Man*, p. 224.

XUM

faith, for he believed, "...the basis of Catholic dogma aimed at furthering and explaining the union of creatures in God through Christ,"[1] and yet he knew, by itself, "Science cannot discover Christ--but Christ satisfies the yearnings that are born in our hearts in the school of science."[2]

So Teilhard believed that evolution is convergent and he identifies the center of convergence with Christ. He attributes a cosmic and a universal aspect to Christ, who is at the same time Jesus of Nazareth. For Teilhard salvation is not the natural result of biological ascent. The grace that is to transfigure the world is the grace of Christ. It is this which will save us. In Teilhard's view, Christ's grace makes use of evolution and Teilhard believes, "that ultimately there can be no natural end through evolutionary progress..."[3] Teilhard himself says, "Christ gives himself to us through a world which is to reach completion even on the natural level by reason of its relationship to him. You should note this well: I attribute no final or absolute value whatsoever to the varied achievements of man."[1] The position given to Christ in the process of evolution is unique to Teilhard. And it stamps his theology with the mark of originality.

---

[1] Teilhard, letter of January, 1912, in _The Making of a Mind_, p. 173.

[2] Teilhard, "Science and Christ," _Science and Christ_, p. 36.

[3] Mooney, _Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ_, p. 76.

Mooney's judgment on Teilhard's theological approach is that, "Teilhard's theological effort to rethink the mystery of Christ in terms of genèse constitutes a viable, though at times highly disputable, interpretation of Christian revelation."[2] It was this highly disputable aspect of Teilhard's theological endeavor rather than the viable aspect which accounted for Teilhard's difficulties with his religious superiors in Rome and elsewhere.

3. Teilhard and Rome

On the thirtieth of June, nineteen hundred and sixty-two, the Congregation of the Holy Office at Rome issued a monitum on the writings of Teilhard de Chardin. The monitum reads in part: "in materia philosophica ad theologica satis patet praefata opera talibus scatere ambiguitatibus, immo etiam gravibus erroribus, ut catholicam doctrinam offendant...ut animus, contra operum Patris Teilhard de Chardin...pericula tutentur."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Réflexions Sur Le Bonheur," in Cahiers, II (Paris: Editions Du Seuil), p. 69.

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 209.

[3] Congregation of the Holy Office, "Monitum on the Writings of Teilhard de Chardin," Latin Text, American Ecclesiastical Review, CXLVII (April, 1962), p. 134.

The monitum did not go into details as to what these numerous ambiguities and serious philosophical and theological errors were. Nor did it state just what dangers were to be guarded against. While this warning was shortly afterwards labeled "unfortunate" by many higher ecclesiatics in Rome, it was nonetheless the culmination of a series of lesser restrictions which had been imposed upon Teilhard early in his academic career. Because of his teaching, especially in connection with the human body and original sin, Teilhard was obliged to leave his post at the Catholic Institute in Paris. It was especially Teilhard's theory on the origin of the human body and of man that "was to be for many years the principal reason for the opposition shown by a certain number...to Père Teilhard's activities."[1]

His publications were also curtailed, and he was asked to confine himself to writing scientific treatises and scientific publications only, and he was informed that he had to leave Paris. The order to leave Paris evidently had been triggered because of his views on evolution, and also what was considered his unorthodox doctrine of original sin.[2] Teilhard left Paris and went to China, and in January, 1927, he found that his connection with the Catholic Institute had definitely been severed. He wrote on May 25, 1933, that Rome had told him he must refuse any situation or official appointment that might be offered him in Paris.

---

[1] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard, p. 110.

[2] Cuénot, Teilhard de Chardin, p. 61.

In April of 1944, the text of The Phenomenon of Man, came to Rome, and in August of that same year, Teilhard found out that permission to publish had been refused. He could not publish the work, and would have to present the manuscript once again for further consideration after revision and after putting it in a more acceptable form. In June of 1946, once again he sought permission to publish. In 1949, he was refused permission, not only to publish The Phenomenon of Man, but even to accept a professorship at the College de France, the highest academic position that France could offer.

i. Orthodoxy

Teilhard was a scientist of the first rank, and had pondered deeply the new evidence which science provided. He was, as has been noted, neither a systematic theologian nor a philosopher. Still he wanted to speak to modern man, and as a scientist it was easy for him to appeal to readers who had the same scientific background. His attempt to put theology in terms acceptable to modern man and in a framework which he believed to be reflective of the evolutionary phenomenon was responsible, certainly, for much misunderstanding. Teilhard, also, was oriented toward the future. He believed that nothing could be

XUM

truly understood from its beginnings, but only from its terminus. His vision was wide and sweeping and oriented to the future. He often expressed views that were extremely hypothetical, especially in regard to the future of man upon this planet, the end of the world, and the second coming of Christ. So it is not difficult to see why his works might have been challenged or might have been met with some resistance. Such an apparently startling departure from traditional modes of expression was bound to be challenged by more conservative and traditional theologians.

In spite of the opposition of some theologians and of the restrictive action of his religious superiors, Teilhard himself never wavered, either in his loyalty to the Church or in his loyalty to his vision. He was convinced that to allow the development of dogma to be rationalized would be equivalent to "impoverishing and vulgarizing it."[1] And he never thought at all of his works as "an illegitimate development of dogma."[2] In October, 1951, many years after his exile and the restriction on his writing, he could say in a letter to the superior of the Jesuits, Father Janssens, "I now feel more indissolubly bound to the hierarchical Church and to the Christ of the Gospel than ever before in my life."[1]

---

[1] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard, p. 268.

[2] Teilhard, "Le Sens humain," quoted by Henri de Lubac, ibid., p. 418, note 63.

Teilhard, then, accepted his restrictions and the lifestyle imposed upon him by his religious superiors in complete obedience, although it is clear that such restrictions were a source at times of great pain and sorrow to him. Henri de Lubac believes that the criticisms levelled at Teilhard were brought about, not so much by Teilhard's conclusions, but "more often and for the contrary reason, by what he omitted to say."[2]

And even though Teilhard's work was begun at a time when modernism was flourishing, "it never, even when some of his conclusions are questionable, acquired any taint of modernism."[3] Teilhard, "adhered, with all his soul, to the unique Revelation, with no desire, either to add anything to it or to reduce it, to select from it or to modify it, in any essential."[4]

The judgment of other eminent theologians and interpretors of Teilhard are in agreement with this judgment of de Lubac. Rideau states that

> There is no fundamental dogmatic statement that is not affirmed and maintained in its entirety; the transcendence and freedom of the triune God; the

---

[1] Teilhard, Letters From a Traveller, p. 43.

[2] Lubac, The Reilgion of Teilhard, p. 198.

[3] Ibid., p. 69.

[4] Ibid., p. 70.

> freedom for the creative decision; the immanence and transcendence of the creative act; man's relative transcendence of nature; the mystery of the Incarnation, mediating between God and man, God and the universe; the mystery of the Redemption; the mystery of the Church and the Eucharist; and, lastly, the mystery of the Parousia, linked with and yet transcending history, and of the judgment that reads and sanctions man's options.[1]

And Wildiers says, "His orthodoxy is not to be doubted for a moment. His love for Christ and the Church are above and beyond all questioning...The renewal at which he aimed in theology never affected the kernel of Catholic teaching in matters of faith, but only its external aspect, the way in which it was presented."[2] And Faricy, in a critical survey of Teilhard's works, says, "Today, the orthodoxy of Teilhard's thinking is no longer seriously questioned by reputable theologians."[3]

ii. Teilhard's Acceptance

In the Introduction to his book on Teilhard's thought, Emile Rideau says, "When the history of our time comes to be written, it will certainly record the 'phenomenon of Teilhard'."[4] And when one considers the volume of writings published about the work of Teilhard, it is clear to see that the 'phenomenon of Teilhard' is growing steadily. Perhaps the rapid success of Teilhard can be attributed to the fact that "Few men in his generation have shared so deeply and with such passion in the hopes, the efforts, the boundless ambitions of his time."[1]

---

[1] Emile Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, pp. 188-189.

[2] Wildiers, An Introduction to Teilhard, pp. 119-120.

[3] Robert Faricy, "Teilhard de Chardin: a critical survey," American Ecclesiastical Review, CLIX (October, 1968), p. 262.

[4] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 9.

Teilhard spoke to modern man with his conviction of faith, his love of the world and his dedication to science. He wanted to prove that man's work is not useless and is not without justification. Teilhard is a person of hope, a hope which springs from God and from the world. He is a person of faith, with faith in God and faith in the world. He believed that the modern world had a need of Jesus Christ and could find its salvation only in and through Jesus Christ. His message, then, was not new, but old, as old as Christianity itself. Teilhard was a pioneer; he explored new paths and opened new vistas to win the world for Christ. He was a truly modern missionary.

Because he was exploring new paths and attempting to create new syntheses, he was not always accurate in his presentation nor always definitive in his conclusions. His desire to be faithful to the Gospel and to be faithful to the world of today led him to attempt a correspondence

---

[1] Père René D'Ouince, S.J., Address at the service for the repose of the soul of Pere Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, in the Chapel of the Rue de Sevres, April 27, 1955, quoted by Henri de Lubac in *The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin*, p. 312.

XUM

between faith and religion. His attempt to establish a dialectical balance between the spirit of today and Christian tradition led him into ways which were tentative and exploratory. His orthodoxy is unquestioned. His acceptance is growing. He addressed himself to a world which was greatly concerned with humanism and humanistic values, and he proclaimed that it is possible to be fully Christian and fully human. His theological insights and progression are rich in possibility. It is the intent, then, of this paper to explore some of these possibilities to determine their value to the ecumenical movement.

Teilhard believed in unity. In the unity of all of mankind and in the unity of the Church. He saw the Church as an instrument of God's will to unify all men. It is hoped that by exploring Teilhard's theological conclusions and evaluating the legitimacy of his perspective, that possible areas of convergence may be found with other Christian theologies, especially those espoused by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. This is done in the hope that unity may be fostered, a unity which was fundamental to the thought and the design of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

CHAPTER III

THE SEARCH FOR UNITY: TEILHARD AND FAITH AND ORDER

1. Evolution and Unity

Teilhard saw that the cosmos was in a continuous genesis. His temperament and his methodology led him to emphasize all the continuities and the connectives between lower organisms and higher organisms, between God the Creator and his creation, and between the world and Christ. Rideau speaks clearly of this Teilhardian thrust when he says:

> His logical insistence on unity and his aspiration for the universal caused him, while retaining the distinction between them, to unite in synthesis and in theory orders or planes that are separated by their distance from the mystery.[1]

Teilhard believed that the history of the cosmos is a history of convergence towards a center. This convergence, brought about by a process of unification, has led to the rise of consciousness and of thought, centering on the personal. He would later, using the data of revelation, identify this personal center of convergence with Jesus Christ. For Teilhard, then, the entire creative process, seen in evolutionary perspective in its totality

---

[1] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 245.

and its unity includes four stages which he labeled cosmogenesis, biogenesis, noogenesis, and Christogenesis. Teilhard attempts a view of the world which is a view of the world's unity in evolution. He attempted to point out that to disconnect the elements in creation by segmenting them in sections that are not unified can hinder the progress of Man, for with such a fragmented view of things man can fail to see or to look for whole problems. Teilhard tries to discover the order and unity within the universe and his principle of complexity-consciousness is what he provides as a means of doing this.

1. Complexity-Consciousness

Teilhard believed, as a scientist, that there exists in the material world a certain number of elements which are arranged in varying degrees of complexity. There is an observable tendency to move from the simple to the complex. Matter concentrates itself into highly organized material structures. Teilhard attributed this to an inner drive which he called the "within" of things.[1] This "within" or consciousness is clearly evident in man and evident in other conscious beings from vertebrates to insects. But the further down the scale one goes, e.g., into the plant world, the more difficult it is to discern this within, and scientists concern themselves only with the "without" of such subjects, since the within is no longer observable and cannot be experimentally verified.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 54.

For Teilhard the entire physical world has this quality of "withinness", but in differing intensities. It is therefore short-sighted to limit consciousness only to where it has emerged in a highly visible form. The "within" is a cosmic property which varies in intensity from the most primitive material to man's thoughts, and it brings with it development of a more complex framework. The universe in evolution, then, is in a state of transition; the manifestation of the spiritual or the conscious is but the complementary aspect of increased material complexity.

Teilhard's view of the relationship of consciousness with the complexity of beings is that complexity increases with the passage of time. At the present stage of the evolutionary process, the cosmos has evolved to the stage where consciousness has arisen. Man, the most significant element in this evolutionary process, has become self-conscious. Evolutionary progress, and now all progress, is measured on the scale of complexity-consciousness. Teilhard says of this unifying principle, "the structural relationship noted here between complexity and consciousness is experimentally incontestable and has always been known,"[1] but his originality is found in the fact that he views this

---

[1] Ibid., p. 300.

XUM

as the manifestation and expression of a universal trend.

Teilhard's vision, then, is consistently an evolutionist vision. Man himself is immersed in and part of the evolutionary process. Mankind itself is directed towards a supreme form of unification, and as socialization continues, is beginning to act more and more as a united humanity. Through modern means of transportation helping to overcome distance and time, and through improved communications setting up almost unlimited possibilities for sharing knowledge and increasing awareness, the socializing process has been increased and intensified, and complexity continues to increase.

ii. Cosmogenesis

Teilhard believed that if the idea of an all-embracing unity is to be taken seriously, then the perennial problem of the one and the many must be re-examined. The many is an easy concept to deal with because of its clear manifestation in reality. The unity, if there is such, underlying the many is quite another problem since it is scarcely visible and so is much less apparent. Teilhard believed, however, that the recognition of such a unity of the cosmos is profoundly reassuring to man because a person, as one individual, tends to be intimidated or awed, and often confused by the size, complexity and multiplicity of the world. For Teilhard, the flow of evolution, mounting from the simple to the complex, and revealing an interconnection of all reality, expresses itself in terms of increasing complexity. This ascent from the more simple to the more complex, can, because of its basal unitive nature, place man at the leading edge of evolution in a position to direct and order the multiplicity and complexity in the real. This can assure man that he is not lost in a vast and tremendously complicated universe to be the victim of hostile and alien forces, but that he is of the very stuff of these forces and can hope to exercize some measure of control and ordering.

Cosmogenesis, for Teilhard, is the first phase of evolution, in which matter was formed from energy and assumed ever more complex forms as time went by. In describing the evolution of matter, Teilhard takes note of the fact that physics came into being under the sign of fixity, and that today such a fixist position is not adequate. Today, the positive knowledge of things must be sought after and identified with the awareness of time and a developmental process. Modern science demands a study of things with a two-fold developmental aspect: a study of the development of things, and a study of things in their development. All of reality appears like a mass which is in the process of transformation. "The universal totum (evolution) is in fact a new and

XUM

common dimension of the universe, and consequently affects the totality of elements and relations of the universe."[1]

Teilhard goes on to say that this is not simply an hypothesis, but is a condition which, from this time on, all hypotheses must fulfil. It is his conviction that this is "the expression for our minds of the world's passage from the state of 'cosmos' to the state of 'cosmogenesis'".[2] He says also that it is only at the present time that "...armed with all our sciences, we are beginning to grow familiar with a universe in a state of 'cosmogenesis'".[3]

There is little doubt that today's picture of the universe differs markedly from that of the past. Up until the last century man's picture of the universe was that of an essentially solid entity. Change applied only to the individual. In our own day scientists have acquired and developed the capability of looking back over hundreds of thousands of years, to discover great changes in what once seemed immutable. For astronomers and astro-physicists the solar system is no longer to be considered static and unchanging, but on the contrary, is considered in the process

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Evolution of the Idea of Evolution," in The Vision of the Past, p. 246.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Teilhard, "The Phyletic Structure of the Human Group," in The Appearance of Man, trans. by J. M. Cohen (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), p. 164.

XUM

of movement and development. No phenomenon on earth can any longer be thought of except as determined by the time in which it is situated. Every phenomenon has an acquired part in time. All phenomena are linked with each other and dependent upon a whole complex chain of preceding phenomena. The image that Teilhard liked to use in this regard is that of genesis itself. He believed that in the 16th century the idea of a universe in motion affected the people more profoundly than did the ending of the concept of geocentrism. And it was a result of the influence of this shocking realization that the whole cosmos began to be viewed under the aspect of cosmogenesis.

A static cosmos, replaced by a moving cosmos suggested to Teilhard the idea of the world as a product of cosmogenesis. Into such a world Teilhard had to bring his examination of the Incarnation, Redemption and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. The law of complexity-consciousness led to a creative union as complex union led to increased consciousness. There is now, from the Christian point of view, an incarnational and redemptive union in Christ. Teilhard wanted to extend his belief in creative union into a union which was incarnational and redemptive. He believed that in a system of convergent cosmogenesis creating means uniting and uniting, for God, means self-immersion. Since the universe is in a state of becoming, a state of genesis, then by identifying the

XUM

purpose of this genesis, which is convergence, Teilhard puts himself in a position to reformulate a theology of Christ in terms of the genesis of the cosmos.

So Teilhard hopes to combine the original concept of cosmogenesis with revelation. This will result in a process which he will term "Christogenesis". This process, in turn, will enable him to sketch out a Christian mystique of human endeavor, an endeavor which will be a participation in the process of Christogenesis, which, like evolution, is universal. Because man is evolution become conscious of itself, then the universe is unified and coherent, containing direction and purpose. As Teilhard says:

> ...this conjunction of Christian cosmology, harmonised and effectively articulated at its peak with Human cosmology, shows itself to be fundamentally and in real values homogeneous with the latter.[1]

So by the conjunction of these two geneses there arises through the action of a God who is both personal and transcendent and through a world which is still progress, "an impulse...that is truly evolutionary."[2]

Ultimately in Teilhard's theologizing cosmogenesis is identified with Christogenesis as Christ is identified with the omega of evolution. All of becoming, all of evolution is directed towards the fulness of Christ and is stimulated by his influence. The evolutionary process, then, begins with cosmogenesis, and passing through various stages ends ultimately in Christogenesis, this latter stage being made known through revelation alone. Teilhard proposes to reformulate the theology of creation in terms of a genesis of the universe. He involves himself in a task to fashion and articulate a concept of spirituality for which there was no adequate model in history. With the idea of cosmogenesis, Teilhard had to forge a concept of spirituality for a world in evolution. He wanted man to accept responsibility for a developing world without being false to revelation, and he wanted to define a spirituality which combined faith in God and faith in the world.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis," in The Future of Man, p. 224.

[2] Loc. cit.

iii. Biogenesis

Teilhard's concept of biogenesis follows the same line of direction as that of cosmogenesis. Biogenesis, for him, was the evolutionary process by which life appeared on earth and by which living organisms change from one species to another over periods of time. Teilhard believed that like everything in the universe of which time is a dimension, "life is, and only can be, a size of evolutionary nature and dimension."[1] The problem of transformism, Teilhard believes, no longer exists. It has, through science, been resolved definitively. He says, "To shake our belief now in the reality of biogenesis, it would be necessary to uproot the tree of life and undermine the entire structure of the world."[1] Scientists still disagree about the way this happens, and whether it comes about by chance or otherwise. But, as Teilhard points out, "on the general and fundamental fact that organic evolution exists..., all scientists today are in agreement."[2] For, as Teilhard believes, "Life, being an ascent of consciousness, could not continue to advance indefinitely along its line without transforming itself in depth."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 139.

Teilhard speaks of biogenesis which "in the end is the same as cosmogenesis,"[4] and sees it leading to the emergence of thought and so the emergence of the human phenomenon. For he states that, "since the birth of thought man has been the leading shoot of the tree of life."[5] This genesis of life rising from cosmos to life to man is fundamental to his theological perspective which he reveals in a letter written in 1951. He sees three levels of activity for his work, one dealing with research on Fossil Man, another directed toward a study of the convergent

---

[1] Ibid., p. 140.

[2] Loc. cit. Footnote one.

[3] Ibid., p. 166.

[4] Ibid., p. 276.

[5] Loc. cit.

XUM

nature of evolution as exemplified in man, and the third is, "To pursue...my effort to re-think Christology and Christianity in terms of a humanity in process of biological convergence."[1]

Teilhard, then, sees man, both as a physical reality and as a thinking being who can reflect upon himself reflecting, having emerged from the process of cosmogenesis through biogenesis. His concern is to consider man, within and without, as a phenomenon, and only then, with a firm grasp on the reality of this phenomenon, will he consider the Christ event and its significance.

2. The Phenomenon of Man

Teilhard's search for unity led him to consider the world as united organically, a world which is evolving along the axis of increasing complexity-consciousness. As this evolution takes place in time its axis passes through two points. The first point is the appearance of life in the world. The second point of the axis is the appearance of reflective consciousness constituting the phenomenon of man. It is reflection that Teilhard sees as the central phenomenon of man. Experimentally viewed, reflection is "the power acquired by a consciousness to turn in upon itself."[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, Letters From a Traveller, p. 321.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 165.

Teilhard admits that biologists differ among themselves as to whether or not there is a direction or even an axis of evolution, and psychologists are not agreed as to whether there is any specific difference between the human psyche and that of man's predecessors. He takes the phenomenon of reflection as decisive in establishing the uniqueness of man. Teilhard sees a definite direction and orientation to evolution. He sees evolution moving in the direction of increasing complexity which produces a greater consciousness. Evolution tends toward the spiritual and the personal. Teilhard cannot stress strongly enough that man is different from other species, that he is unique. He is not simply a more highly developed form of another species, but is the logical outcome of an evolutionary process which has developed over eons of time. Man is not only the summit of the evolutionary process leading the way, but he is the key to understanding all of nature that has gone into his making. He has all the external appearances of a lower species, but thought has entered in to establish man's uniqueness. Reflection, allowing the living element to be constituted as a center which can bind together all impressions and experiences and weld them into a unity conscious of itself and its own organization, raises itself to a new level, a level which allows for such human activities as reason, choice, abstraction, logic, art, and mathematics. As Teilhard says, "Because we are reflective we are not only different but quite other. It is not a matter of change of degree, but of a change of nature, resulting from a change of state."[1] And just as life first appeared on earth presenting an element radically new, so he finds "the whole curve of biogenesis reappearing summed up and clarified in the emergence of the power of reflection."[2]

It is this phenomenon of man constituted as a new being because of reflection that Teilhard feels is neglected by scientists. "Morphologically the leap was extremely slight"[3] but the results were profound. In this, says Teilhard, "lies the whole human paradox",[4] but it is a paradox not treated adequately by the scientists. Physics has revealed to man the elemental structures of reality and has discovered the world of the atom. The science of biology attempts to discover an order to the constructions of life. Anthropology supported by both sciences tries to explain the structure and psychology of the human body. Taken together the results do not explain the total reality. Therefore, for Teilhard, "science, in its present-day reconstructions of the world, neglects an essential factor or, rather, an entire dimension of the universe,"[1] a dimension which "constitutes a radical advance on all forms of life that have gone before..."[2]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 166.

[2] _Loc_. _cit_.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 163.

[4] _Loc_. _cit_.

i. Anthropogenesis

In the past anthropogenesis took place automatically, without planning on man's part. For Teilhard evolution has revealed itself as having direction through complexity to consciousness, producing the human and tending toward the personal. Man now can grasp what is happening and is in a position to guide the future course of evolution. Teilhard offers the possibility that the most significant event in the history of the earth taking place at the present time may be the discovery, although gradual, "not merely of Something but of Someone at the peak created by the convergence of the evolving universe upon itself."[3]

For Teilhard matter is not merely the result of the juxtaposition and aggregation of atoms, but demands that "a mysterious identity must absorb and cement them."[4] Here he is referring to energy which is "the measure of that which passes from one atom to another in the course of their transformations"[1] and which "nowadays represents for science the most primitive form of universal stuff."[2] In identifying man with the process of anthropogenesis Teilhard proposes, against the opinion of many biologists, that evolution is still continuing. In opposition to what he calls the "wholly illogical and arbitrary idea of arrested humanisation"[3], he believes that "the power of reflection---far from having come to a stop, is entering a critical period of intensification and renewed growth."[4] He believes that what is happening in the world at present is "not merely the multiplication of men but the continual shaping of Man."[5] It is this faith in man and in the future, "a future that is not simply the unfolding of Time, but which is being constructed in advance of us"[6] that constitutes the central problem of man today in dealing with the sacred and the secular.

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid., p. 165.

[3] Teilhard, "On the Probable Coming of an Ultra-Humanity," in The Future of Man, p. 279.

[4] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 42.

The shaping of man is influenced by the phenomenon of socialization, as man through the impact of technological, scientific and economic focus is obliged to live in a closer community. Yet such forces can serve to separate men from one another and promote disunity rather than unity. Teilhard holds that more than necessity and logic are needed if man is to progress in his humanity. He emphasizes that mankind "will only become thoroughly unified under the influence of some form of _affective_ energy..."[1]

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," in *The Future of Man*, p. 262.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

Like the origin of life itself, then, the coming of man was in some way not a gradual passage, but was a sudden single crossing of the line between two generations. It was a mutation into a new nature. Man was something new. His emergence is lost in the depths of history for "Man came silently into the world",[2] but since that time he has populated the earth with a covering of thinking elements. The power of reflection is intensifying and growing. It is the principal axis of the human being. Reflection conserves and reshapes the totality and the essence deposited in man. Teilhard says, "To this grand process of sublimation it is fitting to apply with all its force the word hominisation."[3] Man is becoming. He is in genesis. Psychogenesis has led to the emergence of man. The process continues as the thinking elements multiply in the world forming what Teilhard considers as a 'thinking layer'. After the crisis of reflection there follows "the engendering and subsequent development of all stages of the mind, in one word noogenesis."[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Human Unanimisation," in _The Future of Man_, p. 284.

[2] Teilhard, _The Phenomenon of Man_, p. 183.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 180.

ii. Noogenesis

It was the consistency and logic of Teilhard which led him to ask "How could we imagine a cosmogenesis reaching right up to mind without being thereby confronted with a noogenesis?"[2] In an earlier essay commenting on the study of earthly realities by scientists, Teilhard urged that attention be given to "the mysterious stream of consciousness of which we form a part"[3] realizing that "thought has never yet been studied in the same way as the immensities of matter, as a reality of cosmic and evolutionary nature. Let us take this step."[4]

It was this step that led Teilhard to his concept of noogenesis. The central phenomenon of man is his power to reflect. Man is a different being who lives a reflective life. The question before Teilhard and other scientists,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

[2] Ibid., p. 220.

[3] Teilhard, "Man's Place in Nature," in *The Vision of the Past*, p. 181.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

XUM

then, was whether man had reached the supreme stage of finality, a stage beyond which he could not advance. To this Teilhard answered a definitive "NO." For him "Nothing could be more depressing"[1] and he states emphatically that "No proof exists that man has come to the end of his potentialities, that he has reached his highest point."[2] He believed that within the dimension of reflection, that which makes a man to be a man, an evolution is progressing as man increases both in the quantity and in the quality of his knowledge. Man is becoming more knowledgeable and more aware, and therefore more human. This growth is stimulated by the process of socialization which has led to "the growth of a collective memory," "development, through the increasingly rapid transmission of thought" and "growth, through the interaction and ever-increasing concentration of individual viewpoints of a faculty of common vision,"[3] going beyond a static world to one of atomised energy. For Teilhard, "The Noosphere is adding to its internal fibres and tightening its network."[4] He believes that it is only when opposed to other men that the individual man can uncover his own depth and wholeness.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Life and the Planets," in The Future of Man, p. 113.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Teilhard, "The Planetisation of Mankind," ibid., p. 132.

[4] Loc. cit.

He says, "However personal and incommunicable it may be at its root and origin, Reflection can only be developed in communion with others. It is essentially a social phenomenon."[1]

Teilhard maintains that the social phenomenon is precisely what one would expect from a study of evolution. Recognizing the progress in the world through what he called "the forces of collectivisation,"[2] he reviews this extraordinary condition to which men today are subject. He says:

> The phenomenon calls for no detailed description. It takes the form of the all-encompassing ascent of the masses; the constant tightening of economic bonds; the spread of financial and intellectual associations; the totalisation of political regimes; the closer physical contact of individuals as well as of nations; the increasing impossibility of being or acting or thinking _alone_--in short the rise, in every form, of the _Other_ around us.[3]

Teilhard believes that individuals are converging, one upon the other on the mental level. Convergence and union is no longer at the level of matter but in the dimension of reflection. We are witnesses to a progressive formation of highly complex, interrelated and interdependent social institutions. These social phenomena are the continuation of the law of complexity-consciousness which has guided the evolutionary force from its very beginning. Noogenesis involves, then, not only the reality of man, but also the progressive growth of thought surrounding the earth and involving all mankind. It is Teilhard's term to explain the idea that man is evolving in a manner which is similar or analogous to the way that matter evolved in cosmogenesis, and life evolved in biogenesis. He believed that concentration has always, in the past, led to a higher form of life. Man is not only the last phase of creation, but is the inner reason why all of the previous development of the cosmos had to happen. All of creation was a preparation for the appearance of man. It made possible his existence, and having emerged from the cosmos, man now is able to give significance to the entire universe.

---

[1] _Loc_. _cit_.

[2] Teilhard, "Life and the Planets," _ibid_., p. 113.

[3] _Loc_. _cit_.

Noogenesis in the domain of evolution is the domain of the life of reflection. No longer is there a formation of more complex biological organisms, but rather there is a growth of ever more complex and interrelated social institutions which are heightening man's awareness of his place in nature. Noogenesis is "intelligence struggling step by step from the beginning to overcome the encircling illusion of proximity."[1] The noosphere concentrates and crowns "everything precious, active and progressive originally contained in that cosmic fragment from which our world emerged."[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 215.

[2] Ibid., p. 183.

XUM

To Teilhard it seemed incredible that man could have lived for thousands of years without suspecting the distance of the stars, or that the outline of life stretched out millions of years behind him. Teilhard noted that "In a cosmic atmosphere which would suffocate us from the first moment...they breathed without any inconvenience, if not very deeply."[1] What happened between then and modern man is the reality and discovery of space and time. It was in the nineteenth century, "under the influence of biology, that the light dawned at last, revealing the irreversible coherence of all that exists,"[2] revealing that "Time and space are organically joined again so as to weave, together, the stuff of the universe."[3]

Cosmogenesis, then, has led up to noogenesis. Evolution continues on the level of thought and can be identified with it. Man, the product of evolution, discovers that he is evolution which has become conscious of itself. As Teilhard says concisely, "The consciousness of each of us is evolution looking at itself and reflecting."[4]

Teilhard believed that much of man's present disquiet would be alleviated if man could be sure that evolution had an outcome, and he saw this outcome related to noogenesis. As he said if man accepts the reality of noogenesis "the believer in this World will find himself compelled to allow increasing room, in his vision of the future, for the values of personalisation and transcendency."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 215.

[2] Ibid., p. 217.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] Ibid., p. 221

In assessing the relationship between cosmogenesis, biogenesis and noogenesis, Teilhard says:

> A cosmogenesis embracing and expanding the laws of our individual ontogenesis on a universal scale, in the form of Noogenesis: a world that is being born instead of a world that is: that is what the phenomenon of Man suggests, indeed compels us to accept, if we are to find a place for Man in this process of evolution in which we are obliged to make room for him."[2]

He saw noogenesis as a phenomenon directed toward a conclusion and a consummation whose very origin lies within it. In his Christology Teilhard expands this concept when he says:

> If the world is convergent and if Christ occupies its center, then the Christogenesis of St. Paul and St. John is nothing else and nothing less than the extension, both awaited and unhoped for, of that noogenesis in which cosmogenesis--as regards our experience--culminates.[3]

So, the appearance of thinking man is the product of the biosphere and the leading shoot of evolution reveals that evolutionary process has gathered all creation together to produce man, and thus has become conscious of itself.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on Progress," in The Future of Man, pp. 78-79.

[2] Teilhard, "The New Spirit, 1942," ibid., p. 88.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 297.

In an extended footnote[1] in the Chapter on the birth of thought Teilhard gives his assurance that this phenomenon in no way compromises the belief that man was created by God, nor is there anything in the explanation that would not allow one to posit a special act of creation or of intervention by God in this process. He had set out his views on this matter years earlier when he said that the creative activity of God no longer has to be seen as "an intrusive thrusting of His works into the midst of pre-existent beings, but as a bringing to birth of the successive stages of His work in the heart of things."[2] Man and thought since their emergence in the world have increased and multiplied, according to Teilhard, and evolution has both a direction and an outcome.

3. The Christian Phenomenon

To his work The Phenomenon of Man, Teilhard added an Epilogue describing what he termed "The Christian Phenomenon."[3] He viewed evolution as tending to consciousness, and in man it attained self-consciousness. Evolution was now personalizing, and man's future development was in the realm of the personal. The terminal point of this progress was called by Teilhard "Omega."[1] Noogenesis progresses irreversibly toward this point, and reflective life, in order to function and progress, demands "a pole which is supreme in attraction and consistence."[2] Scientifically speaking, this pole of attraction and consistence is an unknown quantity that cannot be measured with precision. It is here, as Teilhard says, that "The Christian fact stands before us."[3] Here he sees the coinciding of Christian faith known from revelation with the postulate of the Omega point. It is the Christian phenomenon that supplies "the very cross-check"[4] that reveals the coincidence. Believing that earthly progress demands the success and the primacy of the personal, Teilhard sees that "Alone, unconditionally alone, in the world today, Christianity shows itself able to reconcile, in a single living act, the All and the Person.[5] It is the Christian phenomenon which professes "The palpable influence on our world of an other and supreme Someone."[6] And so he sees evolution profoundly influencing the perspectives and the hopes of Christianity and asks "is not the Christian faith destined, is it not preparing, to save and even to take the place of evolution?"[7] It is this Christian phenomenon that leads Teilhard to explore the coherence of evolution and Christianity, a coherence which he termed Christogenesis.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 169.

[2] Teilhard, "The Transformist Paradox," in The Vision of the Past, p. 102.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 291.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 259.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 291.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 292.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 297.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 297.

i. Christogenesis

Teilhard first linked 'Christ' and 'genesis' in an essay written in 1938 in which he addressed himself to the attitude of Christian humanism. He said:

> To the Christian humanist--faithful in this to the most sure theology of the Incarnation--there is neither separation nor discordance, but coherent subordination, between the genesis of Mankind in the World and the genesis of Christ in Mankind through His Church.[1]

This link had been foreshadowed in Teilhard's thinking more than twenty years earlier when he wrote that "By the Incarnation, which redeemed man, the very Becoming of the Universe, too, has been transformed."[2] In speaking of the mystical Body of Christ and the cosmic Christ who has not yet attained to the fulness of his form, he writes that "Of both we may say that *they are* and at the same time *are becoming*"[3] and it is this process that gives meaning and force to all creation. It is this tension that reveals to Teilhard the necessity of maintaining

---

[1] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," in *The Future of Man*, p. 34.

[2] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in *Writings in Time of War*, trans. by René Hague (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 59.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

XUM

and pursuing both faith in God and faith in the world and calls faith the imperative to build the earth.

It was in speaking to the role of Christianity in regard to the humanitarian aspirations of the modern secular age that Teilhard first used the term 'Christogenesis.' Recognizing the redemptive role of the Incarnation for all of nature, he believed that this dogma could be reconciled either with a static universe or with a universe in evolution. He believed, however, that an unchanging and immobile universe was neither a reality nor even the best framework for the redemptive Incarnation. Teilhard saw a completely materialistic evolution as inimical to Christianity, but for the spiritual transformation of the world he presented the thought that "a universe of evolutionary structure--provided that the direction of its movement is truly located--might well be, after all, the most favourable setting in which to develop a noble and homogeneous representation of the Incarnation."[1] He envisioned a universe permeated with the Spirit of God and being drawn towards the spirit, and asked "What could serve as a better background and base for the descending illuminations of a Christogenesis than an ascending anthropogenesis?"[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Mysticism of Science," in Human Energy, p. 179.

[2] Loc. cit.

Teilhard did not believe the term 'Christogenesis' to be any more disconcerting than such traditional expressions as "building up the body of Christ" and attaining "to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and "to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ..."[1] (Ephesians 4:12, 13-15) For Teilhard this was still the Christ of the Gospel, the historical Jesus of Nazareth. He was attempting to give increased understanding to Paul's teaching of Christ, and as man's vision of the world expanded, Teilhard felt that man's concept of Christ should also deepen and expand. He viewed Christian cosmology as harmonious with human cosmology and through the vivifying power of Jesus Christ he saw that "the Christian believer can illumine and further the genesis of the Universe around him in the form of a Christogenesis."[2] He saw that it is Christ who involves himself with the total universe and that it is "the Universe which is illumined with all the warmth and immortality of Christ."[3] It was this presence of God in the universe that Teilhard wanted to express as forcefully as he could. He believed that "the real is charged with a divine Presence"[1] when "the whole of cosmogenesis is ultimately, through anthropogenesis, expressed in a Christogenesis;"[2] and he saw this presence as a dynamic presence giving energy and direction to the world, assuring its progress and creativity while putting an end to "the torment of a reflective awakening into a world that is blind and closed."[3]

---

[1] Oxford Annotated Bible, RSV, (New York: Oxford U. Press, 1962).

[2] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis?", in The Future of Man, p. 224.

[3] Loc. cit.

Christogenesis, then, is Teilhard's term to express a convergent world with Christ as its center. It is his way of viewing the process of evolution and the universal Incarnation of Jesus Christ. He saw "Christianity and evolution: not two irreconcilable points of view, but two ways of looking at things that are designed to dovetail together, each completing the other."[4] It was his hope that the acceptance of modern evolutionary views could overcome the obstacles that have arisen between faith and reason over the past four hundred years, and by exploring the implications of an open and dynamic Christianity that there would be nothing in the future "to prevent Catholics and non-Catholics from advancing together, hand in hand, along the highways of discovery."[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Super-Humanity, Super-Christ, Super-Charity," in Science and Christ, p. 168.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Teilhard, "Reflections on an Ultra-Human," in The Activation of Energy, p. 279.

[4] Teilhard, "Catholicism and Science," in Science and Christ, pp. 189-190.

In a later essay Teilhard was to link the concept of Christogenesis with the Eucharist saying that "to unite ourselves to Christ in the Eucharist, is inevitably and *ipso facto*, to incorporate ourselves a little more each time into a Christogenesis which is itself...the soul of universal cosmogenesis,"[2] a concept which he elaborates further in an essay written but a short time before his death,[3] emphasizing the presence of Christ in all creation.

Teilhard's concern was to explain the universal Lordship of Christ in an evolving world, an explanation which would center the universe on Jesus Christ and which would reveal the Christian responsibility to collaborate in the building of the earth. It was his hope to unite love of God and love of the world and to do this he felt it necessary from the very beginning to establish a standpoint from which

> Christ and the earth can be so situated in relation to one another that it is impossible for me to possess the one without embracing the other, to be in communion with the one without being absorbed into the other, to be absolutely Christian without being desperately human.[4]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 190.

[2] Teilhard, "Introduction à la Vie chrétienne," in *Comment Je Crois*, p. 195.

[3] Teilhard, *Le Christique*.

[4] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in *Writings in Time of War*, p. 57.

XUM

It is in this context that Teilhard developed his Christology, stressing the cosmic and dynamic aspects of Christ found especially in St. Paul and St. John attributing to Christ a universal and eternal primacy over creation. It is this standpoint that led Teilhard to his concept of Christogenesis.

ii. Union Differentiates

While Teilhard was concerned with the general more than the particular and the whole more than the part, nevertheless he was careful to accentuate the individual when treating of the human species. On many occasions he invoked the principle that a union of spiritual and personal beings does not submerge the individual but enhances him. He enunciated this clearly in the Phenomenon of Man when he stated that

> In any domain--whether it be the cells of a body, the members of a society or the elements of a spiritual synthesis--union differentiates. In every organized whole, the parts perfect themselves and fulfil themselves.[1]

It is this principle, Teilhard believes, which refutes any possibility of pantheism in which individuals are merged with the one. For him, the more individuals come into conjunction with others, the more they find themselves as self. According to the law of complexity-consciousness, a higher mode of being results from greater complexity. To gain is to unite, to diminish is to return to plurality. Teilhard believed that it is a mistake to confuse personality and individuality. In trying to be as separate as possible from others, an element individualizes itself but doesn't personalize itself. "The goal of ourselves...is not our individuality but our person; and according to the evolutionary structure of the world, we can only find our person by uniting together."[1] So the goal of human beings is not individuality but personality, resulting from the conjunction of the one with the many or the other. As he says elsewhere, "True union, the union of heart and spirit, does not enslave, nor does it neutralise the individuals which it brings together. It super-personalises them."[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 262.

In dealing with human beings, however, it must be kept in mind that to be personalized "it is centre to centre that they must make contact..."[3] This introduces the part that love has to play in human union. For Teilhard "Love alone is capable of uniting living beings in such a way as to complete and fulfill them, for it alone takes them and joins them by what is deepest in themselves."[4] It is this propensity in man that draws him to others to

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 263.

[2] Teilhard, "Life and the Planets," in *The Future of Man*, p. 119.

[3] Teilhard, *The Phenomenon of Man*, p. 263.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 265.

XUM

find his fulfilment for "union does not restrict but exalts the possibilities of our being."[1]

Teilhard believed, also, that union makes a man more free, when this union is achieved interiorly. Man can achieve greater freedom only by union with others in an appropriate way. He realizes that this can be a dangerous matter and too often in practice man fails to find his proper mode of freedom, but he insists that true freedom can be found only in union with others and not in isolation.

Faricy recognizes the principle of union differentiates as "simply an application, almost a restatement, of the law of complex-consciousness...the thread running through and holding together his whole phenomenology of evolution,"[2] asserting that every true union is really an increase in complexity establishing a corresponding increase in consciousness. For Teilhard the universe is building up in the direction of increasing unity. Applied to Christogenesis, the whole process of creation in Christ is toward the consummation and the reestablishment of all things in Christ in which the one and the created many blend without confusion into a whole. Teilhard does not hold for the absorption of creatures into God in such a way that creatures lose their identity, but they are brought into a union with God, and because union differentiates, the individuality of the persons is not lost, but perfected.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Formation of the Noosphere," in The Future of Man, p. 183.

[2] Robert L. Faricy, Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the Christian in the World (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 63.

iii. Upward and Forward

For Teilhard the Christian phenomenon demanded of man that he have both faith in God and faith in the world that was God's creation. In 1945 he addressed himself to this problem in an essay on Christianity and evolution in which he offered suggestions for a new theology and viewed the two faiths as complementary and not in opposition, and called for a synthesis.[1] He saw modern man profoundly influenced by the idea of progress and mastery of the world which often seemed at odds with Christianity. He saw the problem in terms of immanence and transcendence, faith in a transcendent God and in an immanent universe and expressed this tension as "a neo-humanist mysticism of an Ahead clashing with the Christian mysticism of the Above."[2] He felt that the progress of the Kingdom of God was bound to the problem of the reconciliation of these two concepts. He thought it "impossible to rise above without moving Ahead, or to progress Ahead without steering

---

[1] Teilhard, "Christianisme et Évolution," in Comment Je Crois, pp. 205-206.

[2] Teilhard, "The Religious Value of Research," in Science and Christ, p. 202.

XUM

toward the Above,"[1] but recognized that a dialectical demonstration of this possibility is fruitless if it remains "*in abstracto*" and fails to prove itself "in act and reality, that is *in vivo*."[2] For Teilhard the world must be taken to its farthest limit of humanisation, not merely by books and writings but by men who attempt to realize the synthesis of the upward and the forward.

Teilhard believed, then, that Christianity was the milieu where the union of the upward and the forward took place. He viewed the horizontal movement in the world as the natural human movement toward an evolutionary future, and the traditional vertical movement as faith in God. The question of their relationship occupied Teilhard especially during the last ten years of his life.

In his essay *The Heart of the Problem*, Teilhard turns his attention to the problem of an evolutionary future and traditional faith and states that Christianity will lose its force in the world, "to the extent that it fails to embrace as it should everything that is human on earth."[3] He believes that a faith in God which sublimates and incorporates in its own spirit the spirit of human faith in the world will recover its lost vitality. He wants to believe wholly in God and the world, "the one through the other."[1] For him this is the heart of the problem "Above or ahead--or both?,"[2] a faith that will save the world with Christ as both Saviour and mover.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," in *The Future of Man*, p. 265.

Teilhard approaches the problem first on the scientific level. He believes that evolution is not random but is directed toward a greater degree of complexity and organization and moves toward consciousness. Everything that rises converges through complexity-consciousness towards a center which is personal. Teilhard identifies this personal center as Christ, establishing Christ as the God of the forward as well as the God of the upward. Christ is the summit of evolution. It is through Christian activity that man builds the earth and prepares for the Kingdom of God. Teilhard does not believe that the consummation of the Kingdom of God will be a destructive, catastrophic event arbitrarily perpetrated on mankind, but rather will come about after long preparation when "the human earth should already have attained the natural completion of its evolutionary growth."[3]

Teilhard counted the world, in the universal and cosmic sense, as larger and much more incomplete than man realized. For Christians there has been the perennial difficulty to follow both the vertical dimension of faith in God and the horizontal dimension of faith in the world. There are some who concern themselves with the vertical dimension, who live for God and life everlasting, but devalue the things of earth. There are others whose energy is horizontal; they follow the direction of human progress but ignore the God who created all. And there are those whose loyalties are divided between earthly and heavenly realities and who attempt a compromise. Teilhard sees the problem as a practical problem, but the solution as theological.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 268.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 263.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 268.

Teilhard considered all human endeavor as a means of participation in the continuous creative action of God, an action which is to re-establish all things in Christ. He sees human effort as redemptive and human activity as a participation in the redeeming action of Christ. He gives an intrinsic value to man's work in the world. So for Teilhard the final maturing of mankind, a maturation brought about by man's activity in building the world, provides the elemental material for the final transformation in Christ. This evolutionary progress and the point of transformation brought about by God's transcendent action forms one simple event. For the forward, towards earthly progress, and the upward, the direction of worship of God, are reconciled in the light of Christ's second Coming.

Teilhard believed that neither faith in God nor faith in the world can stand alone. Faith in the world cannot assure man that his efforts will have any lasting value, and it was Teilhard's opinion that unless there is real hope that man's efforts will have some lasting value, man will eventually cease to act.

The challenge that Teilhard faced was how to be more fully Christian and at the same time more fully human. His synthesis of the upward and the forward was an attempt to meet this challenge. It was an attempt that combined a passionate love of the earth and pursuit of the Kingdom of God. Teilhard felt that "Between Christ in the Church and the human ideal, something has broken down, something has come adrift, there has been a dislocation."[1] To restore what has been lost, Teilhard attempted to anchor modern man to Christ through the world. For the Church to relocate man's position in the world he felt that it was necessary that the Church look anew at its spiritual doctrine and articulate it to modern man in a way that combines love of Christ with love of the world. Teilhard's purpose was stated early in his life when he wrote "No one must be able to say that if he draws away from God it is in order to remain more wholeheartedly human."[2] And as de Lubac notes, "This, in a new context, is the external dilemma of immanence and transcendence."[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Soul of the World," in Writings in Time of War, p. 180.

[2] Ibid., p. 190.

4. Faith and Order and Unity

At the beginning of the first Faith and Order Assembly held at Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1927, Bishop Charles Brent, in the opening address, set both the function and the method of the Faith and Order Movement before the assembled delegates, a task and a methodology which still guide and motivate those participating in this phase of the World Council of Churches' many activities. The focus is on unity, for:

> through unity alone can the Kingdom of God be set up among men. Through unity alone can the world believe and know that the Father has sent Jesus Christ to reveal Him to the whole human race.[2]

And these opening words to the assembly by Bishop Brent are reinforced at the end of his address when he exhorts his listeners, "Let us keep the purpose of unity firm in our hearts."[3] Unity remains the primary concern of Faith and Order.

i. Lausanne to Amsterdam

---

[1] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 209.

[2] Charles H. Brent, sermon preached at the Cathedral of Lausanne, Switzerland, August 3, 1927, published in Faith and Order Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927, ed. by H. N. Bate (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1927), p. 4.

[3] Brent, ibid., p. 10.

XUM

The method for pursuing the unity of the Church is clearly enunciated by Brent. "It is for conference, not controversy, that we are called."[1] For although he recognized that "there are patches of unity already,...in an underlying loyalty to Christ,"[2] still all knew that there are profound and significant differences which divide the Churches, promote strife and discord, and weaken the mission of the Church to preach the Gospel. The profound and significant differences soon translated themselves into action as the Lausanne Conference came to a close. A number of delegations felt constrained to differ with both the content of various reports and the method of procedure in accepting these. Most prominent among the dissenters was the Orthodox delegation who issued a separate declaration, a practice which would continue until the New Delhi Assembly, on behalf of the Eastern Orthodox Church professing a sincere feeling of love and a desire to reach an understanding but stating that in conscience they "must refrain from agreeing to any Reports other than that upon the Message of the Church."[3] The Orthodox did recognize, however, that "although divided by dogmatic differences, we are one with our brothers here in faith in Our Lord and Saviour

---

[1] Brent, ibid., p. 4.

[2] Brent, ibid., p. 8.

[3] "Declaration on Behalf of the Eastern Orthodox Church," ibid., p. 385.

XUM

Jesus Christ."[1] The concept of this unity in Jesus Christ was to play an important part in future Faith and Order discussions.

The Orthodox were not the only dissenters at Lausanne. A declaration by representatives of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches from France, Norway, Latvia, America, Germany and Sweden expressed the judgment that the churches should make a public pronouncement on the significance of the Conference, but should not vote on the propositions formulated.[2] The Reformed Churches of Europe[3] and the Friends[4] made similar statements. But behind all the theological differences, the members were possessed by a solidarity in that which is essential - faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

It is because Christ is the Head of the Church that the Faith and Order Movement could readily proclaim that the Church is one, and make this proclamation a primary concern of its Commission. The Constitution of the Commission on Faith and Order adopted at Amsterdam in 1948, was a product of many years of theological work, but "implicit

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] "Declaration by Members of the Lutheran Communion," ibid., p. 374.

[3] "Statement by a Group of Reformed Protestants on the Historic Significance of the Lausanne Conference," ibid., pp. 409-410.

[4] "Statement by Mr. Carl Heath," ibid., pp. 410-411.

XUM

in the Lausanne Conference were the purposes of Faith and Order, later to be made explicit."[1] In 1948, the Constitution of Faith and Order spoke of its main work as drawing Churches "out of isolation into conference,"[2] and spoke of recording "irreconcilable differences"[3] as honestly as agreements. The present Constitution speaks no longer of isolation, and seeks to "draw churches into conversation and study."[4] It speaks of differences, but refuses to label them irreconcilable.[5] Past agreements and fraternal contact have added a more confident and irenic note to Faith and Order work. The task of Faith and Order is to proclaim the oneness of the Church of Christ and to study questions of faith and order, and those bearing on the Church's unity.

Although its search for unity has not been an easy task and it early recognized that its conferences and reports while solving few problems managed to uncover many more, the Faith and Order Movement has been consistently guided by its original principles. And though the Orthodox no longer submit separate reports after New Delhi, their entrance into the World Council in much greater numbers in 1961, the increasingly important contributions of the Roman Catholic Church, especially since the Second Vatican Council, and the increasing concern throughout the world for development make the words of the Lausanne Conference all the more important as a bench mark for Faith and Order goals. "The message of the Church to the world is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ... It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a theological system; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death,..."[1] For the varied theological systems embodied in Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant traditions, the philosophical presuppositions supporting these systems, and the emergence of development with the growing influence of secularism could have the ecumenical movement in chaos, but Lausanne offered a solid basis for an approach to unity, an approach which focussed on "Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord,...the centre of the world-

---

[1] John E. Skoglund and J. Robert Nelson, Fifty Years of Faith and Order (New York: Committee for the Interseminary Movement of the National Student Christian Federation. Bethany Press, 1963), p. 33.

[2] "The Constitution of the Commission on Faith and Order, adopted at Amsterdam, 1948," in David P. Gaines, The World Council of Churches (Peterborough, New Hampshire: Richard R. Smith, 1966), p. 1116.

[3] Gaines, ibid., p. 1117.

[4] "Constitution of the Commission on Faith and Order," in The Uppsala Report, ed. by Norman Goodall (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 488.

[5] Loc. cit.

---

[1] "The Church's Message to the World-the Gospel," Report of Section Two, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, pp. 461-462.

XUM

wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church."[1]

From its beginnings at Lausanne to the present time, the Faith and Order Movement has increased its areas of concern, altered its methodological approach, and expanded the context in which it has previously conducted its studies for unity. Unity was first seen in relation to Jesus Christ. And when the "early Faith and Order leaders spoke of Jesus Christ, God and Saviour, they meant the incarnation."[2] The Report of Section Three on the Nature of the Church, submitted at the Lausanne Conference, managed to do little more than list the common obstacles to agreement. There were those who believed the Church's Order was divinely revealed and therefore unchangeable. Some saw the Church as free to evolve in its forms, others believed that forms should be modified. There were even those who did not believe in union at all, except for practical advantages.[3] But in spite of the differing conceptions of the nature of the Church, an area of Faith and Order concern which still defies any easy solution, the stress on Christology has proven most fruitful as a basis for Church unity, and still does, as the importance of Christian universalism increases in a world rapidly becoming a village through

---

[1] Ibid., p. 462.

[2] William A. Visser't Hooft, No Other Name (London: S.C.M., 1963), p. 106.

[3] "Report of Section Three," Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, pp. 463-466.

XUM

transportation and technology. As Dr. Visser't Hooft points out, "the more seriously the Christian Church takes its centre, the more universal it becomes."[1]

In the ten years between the First and Second World Conferences on Faith and Order, some important factors were profoundly altering the theological climate. In speaking of the Life and Work Conference at Oxford in 1937, Visser't Hooft says, "The emergence of a new biblical theology, the influence of Karl Barth, the challenge of totalitarianism and the new emphasis on the Church as an inherent part of the Christian Message, made it inevitable that the 1937 conference should think of unity in new terms."[2] It became increasingly clear that the Church had to be viewed as a Servant Church and that its concern was to serve the world. The Church exists for humanity and not for its own sake. It must proclaim God's righteousness as revealed in Jesus Christ and urge Christians to promote peace and justice among all men. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh recognized that "the Gospel of Jesus Christ bears witness to the reality both of the Church and the Kingdom of God,"[3] and as a result of this Conference, the delegates recommended that the Church itself be chosen as the topic of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order. But emphasis was more and more being placed on the Church's role in relation to humanity. The Christocentricity of the Church was constantly reaffirmed, but its role as the chosen instrument for the universal salvific work of Jesus Christ was being explored more deeply, and the unity of the Church and the unity of mankind were beginning to be studied even as the theologians were submitting reports on the Nature of the Church."[1] The Edinburgh Conference could affirm its concept of unity by recognizing that "unity does not consist in the agreement of our minds or the consent of our wills. It is founded in Jesus Christ Himself,"[2] and could stand convinced that their "unity of spirit and aim must be embodied in a way that will make itself manifest to the world."[3] Yet there was a growing acknowledgement that Church unity must be seen in the light of "every sincere attempt to co-operate in the concerns of the Kingdom of God,"[4] although they were by no means in agreement about the relationship of the Church to the Kingdom of God or the extent to which

---

[1] Visser't Hooft, No Other Name, p. 114.

[2] Ibid., p. 109.

[3] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," in The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Held at Edinburgh, August 3-18, 1937, ed. by Leonard Hodgson (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938), p. 232.

---

[1] R. Newton Flew, ed., _The Nature of the Church_ (London: S.C.M., 1952).

[2] "Affirmation of Union," _The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh_, p. 275.

[3] _Loc. cit._

[4] _Loc. cit._

XUM

the Kingdom is realized here and now.[1] So Edinburgh revealed that the center of unity remained Christ, but the circumference was widening. The Report of the Edinburgh Conference on Grace, introduced by the remarkable statement, "there is in connection with this subject no ground for maintaining division between the churches,"[2] was a source of great hope for those involved in Faith and Order studies. Edinburgh declared that God's grace manifests itself above all through our redemption in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, through the sending of the Holy Spirit, in the Church, Word and Sacraments, but stated at the same time that "His grace is manifested in our creation, preservation and all the blessings of this life."[3]

As Faith and Order began to realize that it could not focus exclusively on Church unity and forget the object of that unity, which is the world, it was natural that it should move toward the Life and Work Movement. A Christian ecumenical movement, if it is to be truly Christian, must concern itself with humanity and not only the churches. But in the Committee Report for the proposed World Council of Churches, it was recommended by the Edinburgh Conference that in those things which are of interest to all the churches and which relate to Faith and Order, "the Council shall always proceed in accordance with the basis on which this Conference on Faith and Order was called and is being conducted."[1] A basis which was embodied in the thoughts of the Archbishop of York as he preached the sermon to open the Conference: "the unity of the Church is a perpetual fact; our task is not to create it but to exhibit it."[2] So the Faith and Order Movement was resolved to remain faithful to its basic principles, but to seek unity in a context wider than that of its previous search.

---

[1] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," _ibid_., p. 233.

[2] "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ," _ibid_., p. 224.

[3] _Loc_. _cit_.

The opening paragraph of the Report of Section One of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches states that, "God has given to his people in Jesus Christ a unity which is his creation and not our achievement,"[3] establishing solidly the Christocentric basis of the World Council of Churches. This foundation of the search for unity remained through the Evanston assembly, where Jesus Christ, the Hope of the World, was the theme, and through

---

[1] "Report Approved by the Full Conference with One Dissentient for a Proposed World Council of Churches," The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 272.

[2] William Temple, Archbishop of York, sermon preached at the High Kirk of St. Giles in Edinburgh, August 3, 1937, ibid., p. 15.

[3] "The Universal Church in God's Design," in Man's Disorder and God's Design, The Amsterdam Assembly Series (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), p. 204.

XUM

New Delhi, proclaiming Jesus Christ, the Light of the World. At Uppsala, the specifically Christological referent yielded to, "Behold, I make all things new," as the churches explored God's work in creation with concern for scientific discoveries and technology, revolutionary movements, rich nations and poor, and the racial, religious and political tensions of the day, affirming that this renewal is possible as, "God can transform us into Christ's new humanity."[1] Christology had been a central issue for the Edinburgh Conference, but even though Faith and Order set the issue of unity clearly within Christology, the resolution of the problem of unity could not be found solely within the doctrine of Jesus Christ. The Trinitarian nature of Christianity demands that the churches examine closely the relation of the Father and the Spirit to unity.

The Amsterdam Assembly, in its search for unity, saw the churches' "deepest difference" as the two views of the Church, labeled historically as "Catholic" and "Protestant," one emphasizing the visible continuity in apostolic succession stressing episcopacy, the other emphasizing the initiative of the Word of God and man's response in faith, stressing the doctrine of justification. Because of the different ways of understanding the Church, the delegates to the Amsterdam assembly recognized the

---

[1] "A Message from the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches," in The Uppsala Report, p. 5.

XUM

present impossibility of manifesting unity in organization and practice. Faith and Order believed that the will of God called for some form of corporate union and not a federation of churches. "We discover our unity in relation to her Lord and Head,"[1] stated the Report of Section One.

In recognizing that the Church is God's gift to all mankind for the salvation of the world, the Faith and Order Commission had to face the disagreements of the churches regarding the relation of the visible Church to the New Creation in Christ. The further problems of the relationship between objective redemption and personal salvation, the Church once established and the Church as the contemporary act of Christ, had to be studied, as well as the degree to which the Kingdom of God can be said to be presently realized within the Church. These and other theological questions were facing Faith and Order as it sought to draw the churches further into conference.

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches received a resolution from the Faith and Order Executive Committee that the object of the Lund Conference be the discussion of obstacles to unity presented by differences of Faith and Order concerning the Church in the purpose of God.[1] At Rolle, in 1951, when discussing the division in theory and practice between Church and Mission, the Central Committee, recognizing that the purpose of God is to "sum up all things in Christ," stated that "the Church's unity and apostolicity rests upon the whole redeeming work of Christ - past, present and future."[2] It rests upon His finished work on the Cross, His continuing work as the risen Lord and His promise that He will come again. They were agreed in looking for Christ's final victory, but not on the manner of it nor its relation to what they may rightly hope for within history.[3] For this, further study was needed.

---

[1] "The Universal Church in God's Design," in Man's Disorder and God's Design, p. 204.

(1) Methodology

"Lund represented the end of one stage of the road and the beginning of another."[4] The Amsterdam assembly and its discovery of "irreconcilable differences," revealed the necessity for a new beginning. The dialectical and comparative method of theologizing could take the churches

---

[1] World Council of Churches' Central Committee, Minutes and Reports of the Third Meeting, Toronto, Canada, July 9-15, 1950 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1950), p. 104.

[2] World Council of Churches' Central Committee, Minutes and Reports of the Fourth Meeting, Rolle, August 4-11, 1951 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1951), p. 65.

[3] Minutes and Reports of the Fourth Meeting, p. 66.

[4] John E. Skoglund and J. Robert Nelson, Fifty Years, p. 68.

XUM

only so far on the way to unity, and, "The leadership of Faith and Order recognized at Lund that the Movement had come to a dead-end."[1] The Report states, "we can make no real advance toward unity if we only compare our several conceptions of the nature of the Church and the traditions in which they are embodied."[2] The results of the Conference reveal that the participants did not record agreements and disagreements on those subjects which were dividing the churches, but they did seek to begin a study of the biblical teaching about the relationship between Christ and the Church. This decision to explore "The Mystery of His life" which is "the mystery of the Church's life"[3] was looked upon by theologians themselves as a direction offering much promise.

At Lausanne and Edinburgh it proved impossible to approach directly the subject of the nature of the Church. With the preparatory work submitted for the Lund Conference and with the successful resolution of the crisis in methodology, it was possible to begin a new approach to unity, an approach based on biblical scholarship and an agreement to attempt to reach a common understanding of the mystery of the union of Christ with His Church. Lund strengthened agreements in the Church as the Body of Christ, in the belief that Jesus, in His incarnation, death and resurrection has entered into oneness with man in his estrangement and through Him God has given a new beginning to lost humanity.[1] The unity of the Church on earth must be understood from the unity of Christ. For Christ lives in His Church. He is never without His Church. Nor is the Church ever without Christ. They are inseparable.

---

[1] Skoglund and Nelson, ibid., p. 74.

[2] "A Word to the Churches," The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lund, August 15-28, 1952, ed. by Oliver S. Tomkins (London: S.C.M., 1953), p. 15.

[3] 'Christ and His Church,' Section Two, "The Report to the Churches," in The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 22.

The Evanston Assembly followed the Lund Conference by only two years, allowing scarcely enough time for any significant advance in Faith and Order Studies. A number of theological commissions had been set up after Lund, however, among which was the Commission on Christ and the Church. In this study, the theologians began "to catch an early vision of a truly ecumenical ecclesiology."[2] The focus of unity was on the unity given by Jesus Christ. The locus was the Church, but an understanding of the nature of this unity and an attempt to offer a description of it had made little advance since the Lausanne Conference.

(2) Widening Circumferences

The doctrine of the Lordship of Christ over the Church offered a promising approach to unity, and was relevant to all ecumenical concerns, but there was growing recognition that the Lordship of Christ could not be solely restricted to those who were willing to accept His rule. If the Lord is actively at work exercising his sovereignty over nations and people, then the Church must participate in responsible action in the world. The circumference was widening in an attempt to meet this challenge. The Division of Studies suggested that an ecumenical approach to biblical interpretation be placed in a wider context and be confirmed, with particular attention given to the presentation of the Gospel to Modern Man. The basic focal point of a wide-ranging process of ecumenical study was to be "World-Church-Lordship of Christ,"[1] and the point of reference would concern the meaning of the Lordship of Christ for the relationship between the Church and the World. The Studies Division states that, "It is affirmed in the Bible that Christ is the Lord over all things, that there is a cosmic dimension in His Lordship. It is also affirmed that He is, in a special way, the Lord over the Church."[2] The question then arises as to what this Lordship over Church and world means for the relationship between them and what are the implications for the life

---

[1] "Christ and His Church," ibid., p. 17.

[2] Skoglund and Nelson, Fifty Years, p. 99.

---

[1] World Council of Churches' Central Committee, Minutes and Reports of the Eighth Meeting, Davos, Switzerland, August 2-8, 1955 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1955), p. 30.

[2] Loc. cit.

XUM

and hope of both Church and world. A study of this matter was proposed by the Division of Studies, recognizing that the theological Commission on "Christ and the Church," was pursuing its own course of study dealing with the same major issues, but believing that there was sufficient warrant for conducting both studies.

The question of unity, then, was still being viewed primarily in regard to Christology, and this concentration led some to charge Faith and Order theologians with "undue Christomonism."[1] But while Faith and Order believed that a fruitful understanding of ecclesiology demanded this Christological emphasis, nevertheless it was always explored against the background of trinitarian theology. At the Evanston Assembly, the hopes for unity were tempered by a sober realism growing out of the recognition of the true depth of the Church's division, a division which had been begun by and still continued from a sincere concern for the Gospel. This realism is evident in the brief supplied to members of Section One, alerting them to two temptations confronting many Christians: "they underestimate the tenacity of man's sin, which persistently confounds efforts to achieve both church unity and a 'Christian World', and they ignore the New Testament's distinction between the Reign of God as partially experienced within history and as fully consummated beyond history."[1] Biblical study has led many Christian thinkers to reject any theological stance which equates the Kingdom of God with the perfection of the social order. Many theologians hold the view that perfect Church unity cannot be expected until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. There is much dispute, also, whether God's final purpose for both Church and World will take place within history or beyond it. The Preparatory Commission pointed out that "the separations within the Church are kindred in cause and kind to the separations within mankind as a whole."[2]

---

[1] Skoglund and Nelson, Fifty Years, p. 79.

ii. Mission and Unity

The search for unity continued after the Evanston Assembly, and following the suggestion of the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the World Council, the Commission, through its Working Committee prepared a document for presentation to the Third Assembly at New Delhi. The report was carefully considered by the Central Committee and accepted at the St. Andrew's meeting by the Central Committee. The New Delhi statement on unity[3] was based on this statement. It did not pre-judge the ecclesiological question, nor was it presumed to be a definition of the Church. The purpose of this document, virtually, was to set forth more clearly the function of Faith and Order in regard to role in the movement toward unity. But when the assembly at New Delhi accepted it, it increased in prominence and importance, "It became one of the official texts of the World Council, and the influence of this brief, concise formula has been considerable."[1]

---

[1] David P. Gaines, The World Council of Churches, p. 623.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Report of the Sections: "Unity," in The New Delhi Report, ed. by W. A. Visser't Hooft (New York: Association Press, 1962), p. 116.

In the Report of the New Delhi Assembly, the delegates were faced with the question, "Can the Christian Church be the nucleus around which will crystallize the culture of tomorrow?"[2] This question demanded an answer from the faith of men and their response to the present needs of the world. The churches were facing a world filled with injustice and poverty, with discrimination and disease, with the problems caused by developed and developing nations. The problems of overpopulation, rapid technological developments and the growing menace of war were just a few of the many threats to humanity.

The merger of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches at New Delhi increased ecumenical awareness and presented a greater urgency to the cause of unity. A theological consensus about mission did not exist and the numerous missionary organizations had behind them years of division, strife and confusion. This division was theological as well as organizational. Unity and Mission had always had a close affiliation, but world conditions had intensified the problem and increased the urgency for the churches to speak to these issues lest they be considered as totally irrelevant and insensitive to human needs. Faith and Order studies reflected this growing concern. The Committee on Faith and Order agreed that measures should be initiated to respond to the situation. Its members recognized that there was a drift toward varied forms of secularism and nihilism. They stated that the churches need "a radical revision of theological language and will find a unity in their efforts to adapt traditional ways of speaking about Christ."[1] They spoke of the re-formulation of the central Christian doctrines as "an urgent and inescapable task,"[2] and urged that in North America the studies concern themselves with "the varying and powerful facts in contemporary urban and scientific civilization which make the very intention and substance of Christian affirmations difficult to

---

[1] World Council of Churches, New Delhi to Uppsala, 1961-1968, Report of the Central Committee to the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 53.

[2] Reports of the Sections: "Service," in The New Delhi Report, p. 99.

---

[1] "Report of the Committee on Faith and Order," ibid., p. 171.

[2] Loc. cit.

XUM

apprehend."[1] The Division of Studies, at this Assembly, decided to initiate a study on "the Finality of Jesus Christ in the Age of Universal History."

iii. Lordship of Christ

During the two years from New Delhi until the Fourth World Conference at Montreal, the increased membership of the Orthodox Church and the convening of the Second Vatican Council made clear that more attention would have to be paid to the theological differences between East and West and to the implications of the entrance of Rome on the ecumenical scene. The dimensions of the ecumenical conversation grew in complexity as, "For the first time in the history of the ecumenical movement, representatives of nearly all the traditions took part in the debates, and for the first time it was possible to perceive the ecumenical problem in all its aspects."[2] At the end of the Conference, the Orthodox delegation did not feel it necessary to issue a separate statement, an indication that the Faith and Order movement was not standing still.

While the Orthodox and Roman Catholic participation was increased, it became evident to the delegates that modern Protestant theology and biblical exegetes in the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 172.

[2] World Council of Churches, New Delhi to Uppsala, p. 54.

XUM

Protestant tradition also were a force to be reckoned with. The task of Faith and Order was revealed at Montreal as an ever-broadening one, growing more comprehensive as conferences increased, leading the conference chairman to say, in a spirit of faith, that "our problems arise out of the abundance of tasks to be faced, so we thank God for them."[1]

While the conference was, on the whole, unsatisfactory to many, and the delegates "had too much to debate with each other to be able to express a common mind in a single respect,"[2] nevertheless, interesting questions were raised which called for further study. The question of the Lordship of Christ over the world was debated at length. The Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church (North American Section) had raised the basic question of whether a study concerning the relationship of Christ to the world should include a treatment of the Christian understanding of the world. This commission's answer was a "clear and definite 'yes'."[3] since both trinitarian faith and the doctrine of salvation demand it.

---

[1] P. C. Rodger and Lukas Vischer, eds., The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, Faith and Order Paper no. 42 (London: S.C.M., 1963), p. 7.

[2] "A Word to the Churches," ibid., p. 39.

[3] "Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," in Faith and Order Findings, ed. by Paul Minear, (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963), p. 13.

Montreal asked, "Is it to be identified only with the exercise of his lordship through the Church?"[1] It further asked that if it is now, as a rule, exercised apart from the believing community, how is this done and how is the tension between the 'already' and the 'not yet' of the victory of Christ to be understood.[2] Montreal also expressed the belief that "the whole question of the proper relation of creation and redemption needs much further study in Faith and Order,"[3] and questioned a spirituality that divorces God from the earth and all its possibilities.[4]

iv. Bristol

Following the Montreal Conference, the Faith and Order Commission met at Aarhus and set forth a plan of study entitled, "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church."[5] Eventually, this was joined with the Division of Studies' document, "The Finality of Jesus Christ in the Age of Universal History." The final result was,

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," in *The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 43.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[5] World Council of Churches, Commission on Faith and Order, *Minutes of the Meetings of the Faith and Order Commission and Working Committee*, held at Aarhus, Denmark, 15-27 August, 1964, paper no. 44 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1965), pp. 43ff.

XUM

"God in Nature in History," published in the Bristol Report. The report recognizes that the now dominant theory of evolution has brought about a state of bewilderment to many people. The tendency to view non-human nature as a static reality has yielded to a new and dynamic concept of nature and history. "This world-view underwent a gradual disintegration in the period succeeding the Renaissance. The process speeded up about 1850. Now, since 1950, "the quick destructions of its last remnants has become manifest,...[1] It recognizes the temptation to use this as the basis for a materialistic ideology, and recognizes the results of this theory which makes men feel helpless in a powerful and irresistable process of evolution. So the question arises as to whether God is in any way related to this modern world view or has any words to speak to the optimism or the pessimism which this view creates in the lives of men today. So the report states the obligation "to seek a new and better relationship between the Christian message and the modern view of life and of the world."[2]

In order to provide the framework the report raises the perennial question of the motive of the

---

[1] "God in Nature and History," in New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 7.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

Incarnation and supports the Scotist theory[1] which demands a renewal of the concept of the Second Coming of Christ, and an exploration of the relation between history and consummation. This theory, at the basis of Teilhard's theological system, saw the Incarnation as God's crowning achievement. Scotus did not view the Incarnation primarily as a remedy for sin, but saw it as part of God's creative plan from the beginning. The secondary goal of the Incarnation relates to the Fall of man, so the role of Christ as Redeemer receives secondary emphasis. The report calls for an attempt to interpret history saying that, "Conscious human life is always interpreting. As responsible human beings we can never avoid it. Nor can we avoid it as Christians."[2]

The Report of Section One, reacting to the Commission Study on "God in Nature and History," took note of its considerable progress along the lines indicated by Montreal, recognizing that there are divergent approaches to this theme. Many questions were raised in the Section Report arising from the nexus of creation, redemption and consummation. Among the most important are the following: Does man encounter God's will and work in creation apart from any confession of God's redemptive action? How far can creation be interpreted in the light of redemption? How does sin affect the concept of creation and the continuity of Heilsgeschichte? What meaning, if any, has the Incarnation apart from the Fall and sin? What is the role of the Word of God in relation to events in history and to nature? To what extent is there continuity or discontinuity between promise and fulfillment, and between this age and the age to come? What role does the Church have in relation to God's unifying purpose for the world? What relation does the Church as institution have to the concept of the Church as already living as God's world? And finally, the question that places the quest for unity in universal perspective: What is the relation of the unity of the Church to the unity of mankind? If man is alienated and fragmented, how can the Church, through its reconciling work, overcome the destructive and demonic powers of rebellion and effect the oneness of all men in Christ, and of what significance is Church unity in this task?[1]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 13.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 29.

The unity of man and the growing awareness of mankind to express this need led the Faith and Order Committee at Bristol to recognize the need for a fresh approach to anthropology, and top priority was suggested for a study on "Man in Nature and History," which would

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church," Appendix 3, ibid., pp. 130-131.

XUM

parallel the study on "God in Nature and History."[1] The Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order at Uppsala agreed with the decision taken at Bristol to pursue its study program on Church unity in the wider context of the unity of mankind and of creation,[2] while reaffirming the New Delhi Statement on the nature of the unity. The Report of Section One at Uppsala on "The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church," stated that "The Church is bold in speaking of itself as the sign of the coming unity of mankind,"[3] especially since other institutions seem to be more effective than the Church in this area. The churches ought to support all legitimate efforts for secular cooperation and unity, but if it is going to be the means of unification then it needs a new openness and receptivity to the world and its accomplishments.

v. Geneva

The Geneva Conference on Church and Society in 1966 had brought home to the churches the growing disparity between rich nations and poor nations, and the responsibilities

---

[1] Ibid., p. 132.

[2] "Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order," in The Uppsala Report, p. 223.

[3] "The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church," Report as adopted by the Assembly, ibid., p. 17.

XUM

of the churches to meet the needs and aspirations of people in need. The unity of mankind called all men to this task. The unity of the Church must be sought in this context. Faith in Jesus Christ and a sharing in the task of the Church urges all Christians to join in the struggle for social justice. The opportunities for Mission must include and challenge men wherever they are. Its areas in the twentieth century are especially the centers of power which control human life or manipulate people: government, business, industry, military establishments, technology, urbanization and industrialization are all forces for good or for destruction. As the Report on "World Economic and Social Development," phrased it, "To be complacent in the face of the world's needs is to be guilty of practical heresy."[1]

The Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order spoke of the "radical questions posed by the new situation in which we are."[2] It is a study of these questions which will occupy the theologians of the Faith and Order Movement in the years ahead. The mandate of the Faith and Order Movement was widening. The concept of development was gaining in importance and if Faith and Order was to remain faithful to its mandate than it must recognize this emphasis and respond to it. Montreal expressed the conviction that the problem of unity was to be seen in a wider context. The Uppsala Assembly revealed this to be an imperative.

---

[1] "World Economic and Social Development," ibid., p. 51.

[2] "Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order," ibid., p. 224.

5. Summary

i. Purpose of Faith and Order

Since Lausanne in 1927, the Faith and Order movement has explored and evaluated many theological concepts in its quest for unity. Some studies, such as the Edinburgh study on grace, seemed to yield great promise and hope of advance. Others, such as those on ministry and Eucharist, proved much more resistant, although by no means impervious. But throughout all the studies initiated and undertaken by Faith and Order, the consistent focus has been Christ and the Church. A trinitarian faith has always been implicit in Faith and Order thinking, but it has been the Christocentric and ecclesial dimension of the Christian faith which has been the center of its studies. These two themes are those most fully explored in Faith and Order documents and they have been explored in an ever widening context. The purpose of Faith and Order is to promote unity among the Churches so that the world may believe. The task of Faith and Order from the very beginning has been to proclaim the oneness of the Church while at the same time attempting

XUM

to deepen it and make it more manifest so that the Gospel and the Mission of the Church is carried out. The fragmentation of the Church is a scandal which detracts from the credibility of the Gospel message and hinders its mission.

ii. Problem

From Lausanne to the present time the goal of the Faith and Order movement has remained the same--to proclaim the unity of the Church and to seek ways of manifesting it. Since Lausanne, however, the Faith and Order movement has witnessed a change in methodology, an enlargement of the areas of concern and an expanded context in which Church unity is to be sought. Comparative theology has given way to a dialectic process as a more fruitful method to pursue unity. Scholarly progress in New Testament studies gave an increased awareness of the Church as an essential part of the Gospel message, and the ravages of two world wars, combined with the rise of totalitarian governments and the spread of atheistic communism, made strikingly clear that the Church must be a servant Church concerned to serve the world. The emergence of science and technology, promising a great hope for man but at the same time revealing the de-humanizing and de-personalizing possibilities that science and technology hold for humanity and their inherent power to alienate and tyrannize man, demanded that Faith and Order enlarge its context as it pursued its goal.

As it merged with the Life and Work Movement and broadened its context in the search for unity, Faith and Order saw that the Lordship of Christ over the World demanded responsible Christian action in the world, and that "there is a cosmic dimension in His Lordship."[1] The threats to humanity are manifold--war, poverty, disease, ignorance, the adverse effects of rapid scientific development, and many others. The response to the world situation on the part of many was to embrace secularism or nihilism. Christianity seemed unable to speak to the world's problems. Faith and Order theologians saw the pressing need of "a radical revision of theological language"[2] and spoke of the re-formulation of central doctrines of Christianity as "an urgent and inescapable task."[3] A study treating of a Christian understanding of the world was called for, as well as a study dealing with the relation of creation, redemption, and consummation and the unity of the Church and the unity of mankind. Clearly the context had widened and it is within this context that the work of

---

[1] World Council of Churches' Central Committee, Minutes and Reports of the Eighth Meeting, Davos, Switzerland, p. 30.

[2] "Report of the Committee on Faith and Order," in The New Delhi Report, p. 171.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

Faith and Order is being carried on and theological problems are being discussed.

iii. Teilhard's Purpose

There are enough correspondences between the purpose, methodology, and context of Faith and Order studies and those of Teilhard to make a comparison of their theological views profitable. There is one significant modification, however, which adds particular value to such a comparison. From the beginning of its studies the Faith and Order Movement has been gradually expanding its context in its pursuit of Church unity to the present position where it recognizes the effect of evolution on the modern world view and is concerned with the unity of mankind as well as Church unity. It is now studying theological problems relating to unity in this context. For Teilhard, his theologizing from the very beginning was carried out within this context and he treated many of the questions presently facing Faith and Order from an evolutionary perspective and with a view to the unity of mankind as well as Church unity. He spoke of "the instinctive tenacity with which man's thought tries to reduce the world to unity."[1] Teilhard possessed a unified world view, but it was a view of a

---

[1] Teilhard, "Centrology," in The Activation of Energy, p. 99.

XUM

universe in movement. His purpose was to confront and synthesize evolutionist cosmology and Christian faith believing that such a synthesis would result in a new motivation of Christianity and a greater understanding of the role of Christ in history. He wanted to illuminate the correspondences between the evidence of sacred history and the rational demands of secular history. Such a synthesis played an important role in his thought although Teilhard regarded it as only an hypothesis.

Teilhard, then, was primarily concerned with unity to give Christ a central place in history and to stimulate men to build the world by the motivating power of a renewed Christianity. His purpose is rooted in his Christian faith as it confronts the modern world and he profers "a vision of truth whose coherence not only makes meaningful human action possible, but actually stimulates that action."[1] He wants to reveal how God is present and active in the midst of the secularized world of today. His vision of unity is totally dependent upon the action of Christ. It is a unity which is being effected through the Church. It embraces all mankind. His faith, too, was trinitarian, although his focus was Christocentric and ecclesial. Teilhard saw Christ and the Church as indispensable to unity, and saw the ultimate vision as the unity of mankind in Christ and through the Church. This is a vision and a purpose which is shared by Faith and Order as it continues its quest for unity.

---

[1] Philip Hefner, The Promise of Teilhard, (J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970), p. 94.

iv. Teilhard's Viewpoint

Teilhard's emphasis was always evolutionary. This evolutionary perspective informed all of his thought, theological as well as scientific. He attempts to bring together an evolutionary cosmology and Christian eschatology in order to link nature and grace, faith and reason. He rejected the classic scholastic cosmology which saw the world as finished and perfectly ordered and rejected also the traditional theological formulations based on this world view. It was in such static milieu that emphasis was given to God as the Creator and conserver of the universal order of all reality; that sin was seen as an infraction of the order willed by God; that redemption was pictured as the re-establishment of an order which had been disturbed. He believed that such a closed cosmology immobilized theology. It is a problematic for men today, where the vision of the world is more of a world in process, a world becoming, than a world completed. A theology articulated in such a static setting most naturally looks at the beginning of all things and the consequent order. In evolutionary context it is the future which receives the principal attention.

The past has meaning only insofar as it points the way to the future. The emphasis is on the end of the process, on the completion of the world. Eschatology is stressed over creation.

Recent documents in Faith and Order studies reveal the increasing influence of evolutionary thought on theological thinking. The influence of Teilhard on these studies is by no means absent[1] and has even been considered too evident.[2] Teilhard had early anticipated the need for a re-formulation of Christian teaching. His approach to Christology was a Pauline cosmic view. His context was a universal context. His evolutionary vision and his scientific interests oriented him to review creation and redemption in the light of eschatology. No major Christian doctrine could be left untouched in Teilhard's perspective, and he raised significant theological questions and attempted to respond to them in a way that would speak to modern man.

Teilhard's theological conclusions were often tentative and sometimes suspect. He attempts to free theology from the old cosmology and establish it as compatible with the evolutionary and cosmic perception of man today. It is Rideau's opinion that "Insofar again as Teilhard's theology depends on an evolutionary concept of history and a Weltanschauung of total unification, there is some difficulty in reconciling it with the legacy of tradition,"[1] but given this salutary warning there is an immeasurable contribution to be gained from Teilhard's thought. As Crespy points out "theology is always in danger of radically separating a cosmology (generally rudimentary), an ethic (often too general and vague), and an eschatology (purely verbal),[2] and the tightly unified theory of Teilhard is at least a corrective to this danger. It may be that Teilhard stressed the continuity of different orders and minimized their distinctions, and it may well be that he gave undue exaggeration to the signs indicating the progress of human history, but in seeking to make Christianity understandable to modern man, he was searching in the direction of unity and giving direction to those who were also searching. His concern was to communicate to modern man the place of Christ in human history. He studied and explored many of the same theological areas treated in Faith and Order studies, and shares with Faith and Order an ecclesial and Christocentric viewpoint. His bias was cosmic and

---

[1] Hendrikus Berkhof, "The Finality of Jesus Christ," Appendix IV, in The Uppsala Report, p. 307.

[2] "Discussion of the Paper, 'God in Nature and History'," in New Directions in Faith and Order, Remarks of Professor Mehl, p. 90.

---

[1] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 189.

[2] Georges Crespy, From Science to Theology, trans. by George H. Shriver (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), p. 150.

XUM

universal. It has been stated that Teilhard's theology is "polarized by the problem of the 'cosmicity' of Christ" but also that "It will owe its originality and its vigor to this problem"[1] By this approach Teilhard attempts to refute the charge of extrinsicism and alienation often leveled against the Church. He wants faith to turn man to the World. He wants to reveal the presence of God in the secularized world, and to give emphasis to man's creative struggle to build the earth. He desires to effect a synthesis between science and religion, but assures that the synthesis he does effect "discloses the hiatus between the Christian mystery and the rational thought used to express it."[2]

It is hoped that an exploration and exposition of some of Teilhard's theological concepts and his response to problems raised by theology today can illumine or be illumined by Faith and Order studies, either positively or negatively, as an affirmative contribution to the cause of theological understanding or as an effective monitium that there are yet obstacles to be overcome. For Teilhard

> His fully integrated vision, thoroughly marked as it is by the scientific and post-modern ethos, demands a redirecting of the Christian tradition that is very painful for the established churches and their theologies.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[2] Rideau, *The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin*, p. 253.

[3] Hefner, *The Promise of Teilhard*, p. 117.

At the present time Faith and Order studies are concerned with a redirection of the Christian tradition. Teilhard can make a contribution to this effort.

Given his faith and his focus, his great intellectual talents and his apologetic intent, the thought of Teilhard may, in concert with present Faith and Order studies, be brought to serve the cause of unity. The present studies of Faith and Order have raised a number of theological questions relating to Church unity. During his lifetime, Teilhard reflected on many of these questions and offered a response to them. His theories of creation, redemption, evil, God Forward and Above, and the role of the cosmic Christ may be problematic in the light of past tradition and his treatment of some aspects may be partial and imbalanced but nonetheless they may "still stand as markers for what is largely unexplored territory for theologians today."[1] Faith and Order questions a spirituality that divorces God from the earth and its possibilities. It was Teilhard's lifelong task to reconcile Christian spirituality and building the earth. In speaking of Teilhard, Wildiers says "No one has realized better than he the depth and the acuteness of the conflict between traditional theology and the new vision of the world."[2]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Wildiers, An Introduction to Teilhard de Chardin, p. 97.

XUM

Teilhard's work is tentative and unfinished. In places it is highly disputable. But it points out a direction that may be greatly profitable for theologians to explore and one that is presently being followed by Faith and Order studies. It is hoped that Teilhard's reflections will be able to contribute to the search of the Churches for unity.

CHAPTER IV

THE INCARNATION: A DOCTRINE AND A VIEW

1. Teilhard and the Incarnation

It was Teilhard's goal to rethink the implications of the Incarnation and the person of Christ within an evolutionary system and to strengthen the faith of modern man in the Christian message by drawing out the consequences of this conjunction. He was not concerned with the totality of revelation but "only with those areas in which a theology of the Incarnation confronts modern man's understanding of the world in which he lives."[1] Teilhard believed that God is the originator and man is the unique culminator of the evolutionary process. Seeing evolution not as an hypothesis but as a fact, he attempted to explore it as the setting which would be most favorable for a profound and challenging understanding of the Incarnation and a dynamic view of man's salvation and the sanction of the world. He saw the Christ event giving perspective to the evolutionary process. In linking the Incarnation to a world in evolution, he opened new possibilities of understanding it, about which he says:

---

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 64.

> ...because of the genetic links running through all the levels of Time and Space between the elements of a convergent world, the Christ-influence, far from being restricted to the mysterious zones of 'grace,' spreads and penetrates throughout the entire mass of Nature in movement. In such a world Christ cannot sanctify the spirit without (as the Greek Fathers intuitively perceived) uplifting and saving the totality of Matter.[1]

For Teilhard, Christ must be truly universal, not in a partial manner but "to the full extent of Christian needs."[2] This joining of natural experience and faith not only makes possible a true Christian humanism, but "is to define in its essentials, and in all its splendour, the attitude of Christian humanism,"[3] affording not separation but subordination "between the genesis of Mankind in the world and the genesis of Christ in Mankind through His Church."[4]

Teilhard was reacting against any view of the Church which would place it in opposition to humanity or progress, or to any view of Christians which would allow them to negate or transcend the world. He saw Christianity's test to be "to correct, assimilate and preserve"[5] the humanitarian aspirations of the world, and its true effect on the Christian to be "to perfect the humanity in him."[1] His view of the Incarnation in an evolutionary framework allowed him to explore these aspirations of the modern world and seek their relationship to God's plan for man.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The New Spirit, 1942," in The Future of Man, p. 94.

[2] Ibid., p. 95.

[3] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," ibid., p. 34.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] Teilhard, "The Mysticism of Science," in Human Energy, trans. by J. M. Cohen (N. Y.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1969).

i. Linked to Evolution

In linking the development of Mankind with the Incarnation Teilhard wants to respect "the progressive effective concentration of human thought in an increasingly acute consciousness of its unitary destiny."[2] By conjunction of evolution and Incarnation he hopes to preclude a vague or amorphous center of convergence at the end of the evolutionary process. It is Christ through the Incarnation who is now the center of convergence. It is this linking of evolution and the Incarnation that produces a true Christian humanism, puts Christ at the center of the converging and evolving universe and makes him the term of this process.

Teilhard was aware that the Christian faith, rooted in the mystery of the Incarnation, has always based a large part of its belief on the true tangible values of the world and of matter rejecting any form of dualism. He was aware, too, of long tradition which viewed the Parousia as an event of a purely catastrophic nature, an event liable to come about at any time and without any respect to the state of mankind. By linking the Incarnation with evolution he assumes another view, a view in which the "parousiac spark...can only be kindled between heaven and a Mankind which has biologically reached a certain critical evolutionary point of collective maturity."[1] Teilhard is careful to state that this point of natural evolutionary growth which he sees as analogous to the first Christians when Jesus came in the fulness of time, is a condition for the Parousia "But not, of course, sufficient in itself!"[2] since the Parousia is a work of God and not of man.

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," in *The Future of Man*, p. 34.

In linking the Incarnation to evolution Teilhard establishes a chain of events intimately bound in a unity and unfolding in time. By the Incarnation the "first and fundamental contact of God with our kind, by virtue of the penetration of the Divine into our nature, a new life was born."[3] But from the very beginning the world was preparing for this contact as evolution progressed toward the human and the personal, creating by uniting. These forces of evolution in time were "So harmoniously adapted and arranged that the Supreme Transcendent might seem to be engendered wholly of Their immanence,"[1] but in reality with the birth of Christ there was revealed "the profound and gratuitous finality of the Universe."[2] The evolutionary process still continues but now the Mystical Christ, dead and raised to life, is at the center of Creation and has yet to attain his full growth.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," ibid., p. 267.

[2] Ibid., p. 268.

[3] Teilhard, "The End of the Species," ibid., p. 304.

In linking the Incarnation to evolution, Teilhard maintains its gratuity, but now attempts to prove the meaning and consequence of their coincidence. This connection affects his understanding of the completion and transfiguration of the world. Evolution is progressing and the Mystical Body of Christ is growing to fulfillment. The final consummation in Christ is now the aspect under which Teilhard views the entire progress of evolution. The Incarnation, linked to the evolutionary process, is by no means a result of that process. Teilhard insists on the union of both but does not confuse the two.

For the believer this linking of Incarnation with evolution guarantees the final success of evolution, that is, the final success of man. This is a guarantee beyond the phenomenal plane, a guarantee which is established by the power of God Incarnate in his creation. Teilhard says that for the Christian who accepts the consummation of mankind as a precondition for the gratuitous establishment of the Kingdom of God "the eventual biological success of Man or Earth is not merely a probability but a certainty: since Christ (and in him virtually the World) is already risen."[1] Because it is a matter of faith and beyond the plane of phenomenon, this certainty still "leaves all the anxieties attendant upon the human condition on their own level..."[2] but Christian faith assures the believer that the Cross has been followed by the Resurrection.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 315.

[2] *Loc*. *cit*.

Although this connection by Teilhard of the Incarnation and evolution will not yield at the present time a complete understanding of either, nevertheless Teilhard believed that in a world undergoing change nothing is really understandable as long as it has not yet reached its terminus. He says, "If one wants to have an accurate idea of the Incarnation it is not at its beginnings... that one should place himself, but insofar as possible, at its definitive terminus."[3] This applies to evolution as well. And by identifying the focus of the evolution as Christ, Teilhard can reformulate his Christology in terms of cosmogenesis. He is able to combine the evolutionary concept of the origin of the cosmos with revelation and therefore is able to rethink cosmogenesis in terms of Christogenesis. The principle of synthesis of faith in God and faith in the world is discovered in the fact of Christ who is the center of a world which is evolving and which derives its meaning and coherence from him.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Directions and Conditions of the Future," ibid., p. 237.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Teilhard, "Panthéisme et Christianisme," in Comment Je Crois, (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1969), p. 183.

Teilhard's concept of the Incarnation, that God immersed himself into the cosmos in order to redeem it is, "the plunging of the divine Unity into the ultimate depths of the Multiple."[1] For Teilhard "The Redeemer could penetrate the stuff of the cosmos...only by first dissolving himself in matter, later to be reborn from it."[2] The Incarnation itself was only a moment in time and a point in space when God inserted himself into humanity. But because the Body of Christ was organically bound to the whole world "the endless aeons that preceded the first Christmas are not empty of Christ, but impregnated by his potent influx."[3] Jesus could assume the universe uniquely because he himself had already been assumed by it. For Teilhard all things are contained in Christ "Not only in ordine intentionis 'but' in ordine naturae."[4]

---

[1] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 60.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 61.

[4] Loc. cit.

XUM

ii. Linked to Creation

It is Teilhard's belief that the cosmos is still in genesis and creation still continues. If man is evolution become conscious of itself, then man is not only a living extension of creation, but is also an instrument of creation and the living extension of the creative power of God. Through the Incarnation and through union with Christ in faith, human effort undergoes a metamorphosis. The continuous creation of God is linked to the redemptive work of Christ and the outcome of continuous creation is to be the Pleroma. In Christ "all things are created because all things are made one."[1] Teilhard is definite, however, in expressing his belief that "To be destined for Christ is a gratuitous favour of the Creator we have no right to count upon."[2]

Teilhard believed that nothing in the universe is intelligible or consistent except through a force impelling to unity. All the elements in the cosmos depend, one upon another, in the ascendancy order of their consciousness. Since Christ, involved in evolution, is the center, then the entire universe is touched to the very core of its element by his influence. As he says," the presence of the Incarnate Word penetrates everything, as a universal

---

[1] Teilhard, "Creative Union," in Writings in Time of War, p. 175.

[2] Loc. cit.

XUM

element,"[1] and so everything is "physically Christified"[2] and can become more fully Christified. In linking Incarnation to creation he puts everything under the control of Christ from the most minute movement of an atom to the movements of the celestial bodies. Christ "ceaselessly animates, without disturbing, all the earth's processes."[3] In this way, he "assimilates, transforms and divinises"[4] all that is good in the universe.

When Christ is seen in this evolutionary perspective then nothing at all is alien to the building up of this universal body. Wherever processes are at work, so long as they are carried out with a view to unification they are assimilated by the total Christ. As Teilhard sees it "Every process of material growth in the universe is ultimately directed toward spirit, and every process of spiritual growth towards Christ."[5] In the light of this synthesis, he is able to view the three great mysteries of Creation, Incarnation and Redemption in the perspective of a single movement toward the Pleroma. He insists upon the total role of Christ in creation. His starting point is the description of Paul of Christ as "the first-born of all creation, for in him all things were created. (Col. 1:15-17) For Teilhard the world is still being created and it is Christ who brings himself to completion in the world. His attempt to explain the completion is what he has elsewhere designated the "mysterious synthesis of the Created and the Uncreated."[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 57.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 59.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

Mooney believes that what Teilhard is attempting to do is to assert the Pauline Paradox that "the Pleroma of Christ cannot constitute an intrinsic completion of God Himself, but it will nonetheless in some sense be a real completion."[2] Creation is creative in Christ so it cannot be envisioned as an arbitrary act. For Teilhard, to create is to unite, and by placing Christ in the very heart of matter and at the center of creation, he views true creation as the restoring of all things in Christ, a restoration effected by uniting all things to Christ. This unity is aided to achievement by building of the world. This is the necessary but insufficient condition for such a restoration. The world, then, is viewed not merely as contingent or an accessory, but it provides the very stuff of the pleroma, the end of creation. The linking of Incarnation to creation, then, results in recognizing three aspects of the same process which is

---

[1] Teilhard, "La parole attendue," Cahier IV (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963), p. 26.

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and The Mystery of Christ, p. 174.

> (Christogenesis) considered either in its moving principle (Creation) or in its unifying mechanism (Incarnation), or in its elevating struggle (Redemption).[1]

iii. Freedom and the Incarnation

In commenting on the theology of Teilhard in relation to the connection between creation and Incarnation, Rideau points out that "Taken literally and without reference to scriptural context, his ideas would in fact tend somewhat to rationalize the mystery by regarding it as the consequence of a principle, the unfolding of an antecedent fact."[2] Recognizing, however, the framework in which Teilhard reflects on these two concepts, Rideau admits that Teilhard rejects any splitting of the economy of God's plan, and that the Incarnation, in Teilhard's view, is "a gratuitous intervention of the word, a break with history, singular and unique: it establishes and sets up a new order, and is in fact a new creation."[3] And Faricy concurs when he says "The concept of God's freedom in willing the Incarnation remains intact in Teilhard's theology."[4] Teilhard has no intention whatsoever of denying the sovereign freedom of God the Creator. He wants to assert that mankind is not a matter of indifference to God. It is concerned with the completion of the world and, as he puts it, the completion of God, that God might be all in all. What he wants to deny, according to Mooney, is that God is "personally independent of the present world whose destiny from all eternity was to be created in Christ."[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction à la vie chrétienne," in Comment Je Crois, p. 183.

[2] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 167.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] Faricy, Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the

For Teilhard, then, "To be destined for Christ is a gratuitous favour of the Creator we have no right to count upon."[2] Placing Christ at the center of the world introduces us into the immanent action of the Trinity. The act of creation itself, according to Teilhard's view, is gratuitous, and the freedom of the Incarnation can be seen clearly in the act of creation. Incarnation is a further degree of gratuitousness in the divine activity. Teilhard saw in the Incarnation "the personal embodiment of the logos whose activity is coextensive with that of creation, and also a new beginning by which that activity is raised to the level of personal love..."[3] He could

---

Christian in the World, p. 117.

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 176.

[2] Teilhard, "Creative Union," in Writings in Time of War, p. 175.

[3] Michael H. Murray, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin (New York: Seabury, 1966), p. 48.

not detract from God's absolute freedom to create, but wanted to understand creation by reflecting upon the pre-existing word of God and by the predetermining of Christ who links God to his own creation. Creation, freely ordained by God, demanded that the Incarnation happen.

2. Incarnation and Christogenesis

Teilhard's view of both the centrality of Christ in the universe and his work of redemption is found in summary fashion in The Divine Milieu. Speaking of the ability of Christianity to gain the believer's love and secure his faith, he says:

> ...it unveils to our eyes and hearts the moving and unfathomable reality of the historical Christ in whom the exemplary life of an individual man conceals the mysterious drama. The Master of the world, leading, like an element of the world, not only an elemental life, but (in addition to this and because of it) leading the total life of the universe, which He has shouldered and assimilated by experiencing it himself.[1]

The goal of the Incarnation, as well as its direction and meaning, appears in its relation and connection with the process of cosmogenesis. Jesus, through the Incarnation, becomes an element of the world. He exercises his lordship over the world in the first place by living in the world as an element of it. For Teilhard in the universe each element is the center in relation to the total of time and space. By the transforming power of the Resurrection, Jesus becomes not only the cosmic element but the psychic center. Through the Incarnation and through cosmogenesis Christ reigns over a world of which he is not only an element, but a world which he has assumed into himself. As Crespy sees it, "The incarnation and the lordship of Christ are thus in reciprocal rapport. Because he is Lord, the Christ can be man; because he is Man, he can be lord."[1] Through the process of inserting himself into the world and into humanity by taking flesh, Jesus is able to assume evolution into himself, which is to say, to assume the world into himself. As Lord of creation he is able to give meaning and direction to the natural process of evolution. Christ then becomes the term of the evolutionary process. It is this connection of Incarnation and Christogenesis, Jesus as the Christ, connected with all of creation, that prompts Teilhard to say "Christ invests himself organically with the very majesty of his creation."[2] It allows him to see that God can be experienced and discovered in the depths of his creation which is still in movement and to say that "Evolution has come to infuse new blood, so to speak, into the perspectives and aspirations of Christianity."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, pp. 27-28.

For Teilhard the Incarnation and the Lordship of

---

[1] Georges Crespy, From Science to Theology, p. 88.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 297.

[3] Loc. cit.

Christ guarantee the successful outcome of evolution and establish Christianity as the "*unique* current of thought... which is sufficiently audacious and sufficiently progressive to lay hold of the world, at the level of effectual practice in an embrace at once already complete, yet capable of indefinite perfection."[1] The process of genesis reflects the reality of Christ and the growth of his mystical body.

i. Christogenesis

Teilhard first noted a connection between the terms Christ and genesis in an essay written in 1938 in which he speaks of "coherent subordination, between the genesis of Mankind in the World and the genesis of Christ in Mankind through His Church,"[2] as he considers the many facets of Christian humanism. In an essay published a year later, the term Christogenesis appears for the first time when Teilhard speaks of "the descending illuminations of a Christogenesis"[3] as a background for an ascending anthropogenesis. He is considering in this essay the negative effect of materialistic evolution on Christianity and the positive possibilities of a universe being drawn toward spirit as perhaps the most favorable setting to understand the Incarnation. He gradually begins to view Christogenesis as the sublimation of cosmogenesis and continues to refine this concept. The centrality of Christ and its role in Teilhard's eucharistic theology lead him to link Christogenesis and Eucharist. He says "to unite ourselves to Christ in the Eucharist is inevitably and *ipso facto* to incorporate ourselves a little more each time into a Christogenesis which is itself... the soul of universal cosmogenesis."[1] Eventually Teilhard speaks of Christogenesis and cosmogenesis as one and the same reality. It is in this way that he tries to reconcile the upward and the forward movements which confront man. For if Christ is truly the center of cosmogenesis, then the upward and the forward movements must be tending in the same direction. This leads Teilhard to consider the effect of human maturation and its role in the Parousia. Mooney notes that "...this Christian effort to unite the upward and the forward is not simply curative but creative, for it helps to activate the Church's role in human problems...."[2] Human progress has a role in the gradual building up of the Pleroma. Christ is fulfilled only through the consummation of the world, or to put it another way, the world reaches its consummation through the fulfillment

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," in *The Future of Man*, p. 34.

[3] Teilhard, "The Mysticism of Science," in *Human Energy*, p. 179.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction à la vie chrétienne," in *Comment Je Crois*, p. 195.

[2] Mooney, *Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ*, p. 165.

XUM

of Christ.

Christogenesis is not the task of human thought, for thought alone cannot move evolution on its path forward. If the consummation of Christ is to be possible, Christ himself must be active in the world. As Faricy states, "The most active and the most complete agent of evolution is charity; it is impossible to adhere to Christ without involving oneself in the forward movement of the world."[1] For Teilhard Christogenesis also involves "the steady growth, within the bosom of the Church, of a certain Christological perspective,"[2] by which the Church "diffuses or expresses in itself an ever more awakened sense of Christ present and active in the fulfillments of the world."[3] For Teilhard Christogenesis sets in relief, "Christianity and evolution--not two irreconcilable points of view, but two ways of looking at things that are designed to dovetail together, each completing the other."[4]

ii. Cosmic Christ

For Teilhard the universe is completely dependent upon the cosmic Christ who, by his Incarnation, had inserted himself into the world and into the movement of evolution. It was his desire to return to what he believed to be the "soundest currents of Catholic tradition"[1] and seek a theology which links Christ with the development of the entire universe. He believes from revelation that men are called to form a single body and that the humanity of Christ is to be the instrument of this unification. He sees Christ established as "the cosmic centre of creation..."[2] who gathers all things together "at the conscious Centre of his Person..."[3] He believes "the Cosmos is hallowed and renewed by the Incarnation in the very roots of its development."[4]

---

[1] Faricy, *Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the Christian in the World*, p. 195.

[2] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," in *The Future of Man*, p. 33.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] Teilhard, "Catholicism and Science," in *Science and Christ*, pp. 189-190.

St. Paul and St. John speak of a cosmic function of Christ, granting him a total and final primacy over all creation. This function was explored by a number of Greek Fathers. It was this aspect that Teilhard wanted to probe more deeply since he felt it had been neglected by theologians and yet was perfectly attuned to the thinking of modern man for whom the cosmos was a definable entity full of exciting possibilities. Through the discoveries of science the world had been rescued from an immobilist stance to a dynamic entity. Revelation, long adapted to a static cosmos, could now be examined from the point of view of a dynamic cosmos. The cosmic Christ of revelation and the Fathers could give a new dynamism to Christianity and to its task in building the earth. It was to this study that Teilhard turned his attention and explored Christology.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Forma Christi," in Writings in Time of War, p. 250.

[2] Ibid., p. 253.

[3] Teilhard, 'Letter of March 15, 1916,' from "Letters From Père Teilhard to Père Fontoynont," Appendix I, in The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, by Henri de Lubac, p. 285.

[4] Letter of July 22, 1916, ibid., p. 287.

Teilhard also used other terms such as Total Christ or Universal Christ throughout his works to designate the cosmic Christ, but he always used such terms with the recognition that they refer to the historical Jesus. He never had any intention of substituting a Christic principle for the Jesus of Nazareth. The cosmic Christ is definitely established in the realm of the human and the personal, and the cosmic role of Christ is viewed as "a magnification, a transformation, realized in the humanity of Christ...."[1] Through his Incarnation Jesus became part of humanity. Through his Resurrection he took the position of universal center. Rideau points out that what Teilhard is attempting is "to develop to the full the notion of the Mystical Body by giving it a fully concrete physical meaning and linking it to all that gives the universe its solidarity."[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Forma Christi," in Writings in Time of War, p. 253.

[2] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 165.

Teilhard, in linking the cosmic Christ with the Jesus of the Gospel, conforms with the scriptural evidence and reflects the tradition of such Greek Fathers as Irenaeus and Gregory of Nyssa. As Rideau says, "What he does is simply to give a more concrete, more experiential significance to the classic notion of the new Adam, of universal man."[1]

iii. The Historical Jesus

The identification of the historical Jesus with the cosmic Christ and the total Christ is "a truth which is essential to Teilhard's whole theological inquiry. Christ for him is always the Person of Jesus."[2] Teilhard adhered unreservedly to the unique revelation of the Gospel. He believed that to suppress the historicity of Jesus would be to dissipate and evaporate the mystical energy of Christianity. He wrote that if this nucleus is removed from Christianity then "Christianity is nothing but a 'philosophy' like any other--it loses its force, its vitality."[3]

For Teilhard, if there is a personal center to the universe "it is only through the Church's witness to

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 71.

[3] Teilhard, "Quelques Vues générales sur l'Essence du Christianisme," in Comment Je Crois, p. 158.

God's self-revelation in the incarnation of his Word that we can know him as such."[1] It is the Risen Christ of the Gospel who has incorporated into himself the evolution of the world. As he says, "The Universal Christ in whom my personal faith finds satisfaction, is none other than the authentic expression of the Christ of the Gospel."[2] And "Christ born of the Virgin and Christ raised from the dead--the two form one inseparable bloc."[3] As Rideau puts it, "Although he is not blind to certain difficulties of the historical order in the Gospels, Teilhard finds no distinction between the real Christ and the Christ of Faith."[4]

The birth of the historical Jesus is seen by Teilhard as a turning point in history. It combines everything that came before at the same time that it inaugurates a new epoch of evolution towards love and towards the personal. It is true that Teilhard seldom refers in his writings to the historical Jesus; this, however, is in keeping with his principle that in order to be fully understood, the past must be seen in relation to the future or to its end. He says "if we want to form a correct idea of the Incarnation,...it is not at its beginnings that we should place ourselves, but as far as possible, at its final term."[1] The full significance of the Incarnation is found in its eschatological meaning. Yet the historical Jesus is absolutely necessary to Teilhard's theological understanding since evolution is tending toward the spiritual and personal and Christ is its moving force and terminus. As he said in The Divine Milieu, "We never depart from the Jesus of the Gospels. On the contrary, we feel a growing need to enfold ourselves ever more firmly within this human truth."[2] And it is the judgment of de Lubac that "there is no blurring of the Person of the Incarnate Word or of the historic reality of Jesus of Nazareth...."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 94.

[2] Teilhard, "Comment Je Crois," in Comment Je Crois, p. 149.

[3] Teilhard, "Introduction à la vie chrétienne," in Comment Je Crois, p. 187.

[4] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 169.

(1) Personal Savior

Teilhard, in speaking of the cosmic Christ, the mover and center of cosmogenesis in no way wants to deny the salvation of the individual and the individual's need of Christ as savior. In speaking of the upward and the forward movements, Teilhard envisions a "Christian Faith, aspiring Upward, in a personal transcendency towards the

---

[1] Teilhard, "Panthéisme et Christianisme," in Comment Je Crois, p. 83.

[2] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 95.

[3] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 78.

Highest"[1] and a "Human Faith, driving Forward to the ultra-human."[2] In attempting to bring them together he speaks of "Christ who is both Saviour and Mover, not only of individual men but of anthropogenesis as a whole."[3] It is Teilhard's cosmic viewpoint which moves him to concentrate on total redemption and to give less attention to individual salvation. He wants to strengthen the possibility of belief in the modern world and sees that the key to this can be found in presenting the possibility of believing totally in God and in the world. For him this necessitated belief "In a Christ no longer seen only as the Saviour of individual souls, but (precisely because He is the Redeemer in the fullest sense) as the ultimate mover of anthropogenesis."[4]

For Teilhard Christ as the personal Savior is also at the center of cosmogenesis, so he views salvation not only individually but corporately. But the redemptive work of Christ is not cosmic only. Salvation itself, when written in cosmic terms is, for Teilhard, an eschatological event, but he believes also that each individual who encounters Christ through his faith is saved here and now by that faith. Personal salvation becomes important "not so much because it will bring about our own beatification as because it makes us effect in ourselves the salvation of the world."[1] Teilhard wants to emphasize the positive side of redemption not only because the expiatory aspect of Christ's saving work has generally received much more attention from theologians, but also because he believes the modern temper is more inclined to turn its attention towards building and recasting. He wants to give the meaning of the Cross a greater breadth and a more dynamic aspect. For Teilhard the Cross should be "the symbol not merely of the obscure regressive side of the universe, but also, and especially, of the triumphant and luminous side of a universe in genesis."[2] It was, then, this cosmic aspect of salvation that commanded his attention and which he explored hoping to do so "without losing sight of the aspect of 'expiative' in the saving work of Christ."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," in _The Future of Man_, p. 269.

[2] _Loc_. _cit_.

[3] _Loc_. _cit_.

[4] _Loc_. _cit_. Footnote One.

(2) Body of Christ

Teilhard sees the historical Jesus of Nazareth, raised from the dead, as the center of creation. He has become the universal Christ living and reigning, the one in whom all things hold together. From Revelation Teilhard accepted the Pauline notion of the Mystical Body of Christ and believed that the Church "is alone at this time in preserving effectively the idea and the experience of a Personal Godhead."[1] He stated that if Christianity is to preserve its predominant role in mankind it must make recognizable "the notion of the Mystical Body, taken in its fullest and most profound sense."[2] For Teilhard, the approach to be taken in bringing about this recognition began with an organic notion of the Mystical Body of Christ.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 123.

[2] Teilhard, "Introduction à la vie chrétienne," in Comment Je Crois, p. 192.

[3] Ibid., p. 191.

Teilhard views Christ as "the organic center of the entire universe."[3] He decried the overemphasis in Christology on logical and juridical relationships and espoused "the primacy of the organic over the juridical,"[4] an organic view which leads to the standpoint where "the central dignity of Christ is seen to be a vast all-embracing Reality--that remodels and recasts every belief, every observance and every system..."[1] He saw this organic view of the Mystical Body as harmonious with a world in evolution, a world becoming. He believed that as long as the Incarnation is explained in juridical terms, it appears as a simple phenomenon which could be imposed over any kind of world at all. He faulted the Latin Fathers for overstressing the legalistic aspect of Pauline theology stating that "Under their influence the Christian history of the world has taken on the appearances of a legal trial between God and his creatures."[2] Ignoring the tradition of the Greek Fathers, he thought, led to the situation where "cosmology tended to be reduced to an argument about ownership."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Christologie et Évolution," in Comment Je Crois, p. 108.

[2] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 124.

[3] Teilhard, "Note on the Universal Christ," in Science and Christ, p. 14.

[4] Ibid., p. 19.

For Teilhard, in his unitary system, all created reality is organic. He rejected a metaphysical understanding of the Pauline notion of the Mystical Body of Christ, and embraced the organic understanding of this mystery, a stance which was the basis of his attempt to understand not only that Jesus is Lord, but how Jesus is Lord. He saw the organic relationship not only as true but as eminently suitable for his apologetic intent. He believed he was using Paul's vision to understand the modern universe and its relationship to God. To conceive of the Mystical Body of Christ as a human association or as a natural social aggregation is, for Teilhard, to "dangerously weaken the thought of Scripture."[1]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Teilhard, "Christologie et Évolution," in Comment Je Crois, p. 107.

[3] Loc. cit.

iv. Omega

Teilhard's reasoning, from cosmogenesis to anthropogenesis, led him to postulate a personal center for the evolutionary process as evolution moved toward the spiritual and toward the human and personal. The process of complexity-consciousness, resulting in man, continues to work in man through socialization. Teilhard postulates a critical point of socialization, a point which results from intense personalization through the principle of "union differentiates." He calls this point Omega.[2] It is not comprised as a center established by the fusion of elements but is "a distinct centre radiating at the core of a system of centres...."[3] It is the final point of evolution, the point of arrival marking the maturity of a world that has become centered. It is the realization that happens when everything that rises converges into a unity. Omega is nothing else but the completion of convergent evolution, an evolution which has given rise to an intelligible world and intelligence in the world.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in Writings in Time of War, p. 48.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 259.

[3] Ibid., p. 262.

In analyzing the conditions for the future existence of Omega, Teilhard posits the actual existence of an Omega point that is independent and self-subsistent, one that transcends the process of evolution. It is his faith that leads him to identify the Omega point with Jesus Christ. He identifies the personal Christ as the term of evolution and so identifies Christ as Omega. Omega, the point towards which all evolution is directed, can be characterized as full existence. Evolution itself, through the law of complexity-consciousness shows forth a unity which involves every element in the universe. Omega, the final term, can be described by the words unity and totality. For Teilhard, it is his faith which leads him to say "the revealed Christ is identical with Omega."[1] Christ is the moving center of that which gives direction to the process of cosmogenesis and "Christ, here and now, fills for us the place of Omega Point."[2] Between the concept of Omega as the term of convergent evolution and the role of Christ in creation, Teilhard sees a perfect coincidence which leads him to identify Omega and Christ. For Teilhard

---

[1] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 54.

[2] Teilhard, "Super-Humanity, Super-Christ, Super-Charity," in Science and Christ, p. 165.

Christ "represents the focus point towards which and in which all things converge."[1] It is toward Christ that one must turn in looking ahead toward an increase and deepening in humanization and personalization. Since everything in the universe proceeds towards Christ, the entire process of genesis is expressed in a Christogenesis and "the real is charged with a divine Presence."[2] Christ appears as the person who brings about an approach and a contact with all of reality.

As Omega and Christ are identical, and evolution is toward Omega, then all evolution is toward Christ. It is not possible to consider a creation which is not centered on Christ. Because of the redemptive action of Christ through the Incarnation, Omega, the final point of convergence, is not centered on evolution, but on Christ. This supremacy of Jesus Christ over all creation can, for Teilhard, be expressed in two essential affirmatives. "'In eo omnia constant' (Col. 1:17) and 'Ipse est qui replet omnia' (Col. 2:10, cf. Eph. 4:9), from which it follows that 'Omnia in omnibus Christus' (Col. 3:11)--the very definition of omega."[3] It is Christ in a finality which leads the world to completion, to its unity and its totality.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 170.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 168.

[3] Teilhard, "My Universe," in _Science and Christ_, p. 54.

3. Faith and Order and the Incarnation

Father Gustave Weigel, the Jesuit theologian and pioneer ecumenist in the Catholic Church in America, in speaking of the Church, says that, "On the rock of Incarnation all theologies must be tested,"[1] for the Incarnation is not to be viewed as merely one historical event, but rather as the total re-creation of the human situation. In the New Testament there are many symbols used for the Church but the symbol of the Church as the Body of Christ is one that is singularly rich in meaning and in promise.

It was on this rock of Incarnation that the Faith and Order Movement took its stand at Lausanne in 1927. Recognizing first the work of God's Spirit in all of humanity, and particularly in the people of Israel, the delegates affirmed "in the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth."[2]

Lausanne spoke also of "Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord,"[3] and

---

[1] Gustave Weigel, S.J., "Catholic Ecclesiology in Our Time," in Christianity Divided, ed. by Daniel J. Callahan, Heiko A. Oberman and Daniel J. O'Hanlon, S.J. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961) p. 188.

[2] "The Church's Message to the World - the Gospel," Report of Section Two, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, pp. 461-462.

[3] Ibid., p. 462.

XUM

Dr. Visser't Hooft gives assurance that the leaders of the Faith and Order Movement meant the Incarnation when they referred to Jesus Christ as God and Savior.[1] It is through the Incarnation that God revealed his love for man and calls him to a life of faith and service. It is through the life and ministry of Jesus, through His proclamation of the Coming Kingdom of judgment, and especially through His Passion, death and resurrection and the sending of the Spirit, that man receives forgiveness of his sins. Jesus Christ is Himself the Gospel and "the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world,"[2] a "gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death,...the victory over sin and death,...the revelation of eternal life."[3]

Lausanne, then, built its hopes for unity upon the Incarnation, upon Jesus Christ as the center of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. The conference members at Edinburgh continued to build on this basis affirming "the uniqueness and supremacy of the revelation given in Christ, in whose Name alone salvation is offered to the world,"[4] and stating that, "This divine revelation is addressed to man in the wholeness of his personality, and is apprehended by faith."[1] The delegates at Edinburgh were confident in their hopes professing that the presence of Christ in the Church has been perpetual and that Christ will remain faithful to "the promise of His presence and will so continue till the consummation of all things."[2] In affirming their allegiance to Jesus Christ and to this Incarnation, they re-affirmed Him as the basis of their unity. "We are one in faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word of God," and "This unity does not consist in the agreement of our minds or the consent of our wills. It is found in Jesus Christ Himself."[3]

---

[1] Willem A. Visser't Hooft, No Other Name, p. 106.

[2] "The Church's Message to the World - the Gospel," Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 462.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," Report of Section Three, The Second World Conference on

While there was substantial agreement in the belief of God's revelation in Jesus Christ Incarnate, and the abiding presence of Jesus Christ in His body and with His people, there were other questions which arose during the course of the Edinburgh Conference about which there was disagreement. All agreed to the supremacy of revelation in Christ and recognized it as unique; there were some, however, who held that "the only revelation which the Church can know and to which it should witness

---

Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 228.

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid., p. 231.

[3] "Affirmation of Union," ibid., p. 275.

is the revelation in Jesus Christ," while others spoke of a "praeparatio evangelica not only in Hebrew, but also in other religions, and believed that God makes Himself known in nature and in history."[1] In 1967, some thirty years later, a report entitled, "God in Nature and History,"[2] was presented to the Faith and Order Commission and unanimously approved by them at Bristol.[3] This document explored the mode of God's action in nature and history.

The mode of Christ's presence in His Church was also discussed by the delegates at Edinburgh. The differences were apparent. "Some lay greater stress on the perpetual and abiding presence of Christ in His Body and with His people, while others lay greater stress on the fact that Christ is present only where His word is truly preached and received by faith."[4] The question to be studied was on what does a Christian depend to assure him that he is in vital touch with Christ: upon the possession of ministry and sacraments, Scripture, the testimony of the Spirit or all of these?

---

[1] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," ibid., p. 228.

[2] "God in Nature and History," in New Directions in Faith and Order, pp. 7-31.

[3] Ibid., p. 31.

[4] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," in The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 231.

In spite of these differences which called for further study and clarification, Edinburgh acknowledged that all who accept Jesus Christ as Son of God, and Lord and Saviour "have in fact a supernatural bond of newness which subsists in spite of divergences in defining the divine mystery of the Lord,"[1] although it was evident that the bond of unity is strengthened more by convergence than divergence, and the unity of the Church is made more manifest.

The delegates at Edinburgh were convinced that research should now concentrate on the Nature of the Church, and the Continuation Committee established two theological commissions, one European and the other American, to study this problem, and the reports were prepared in time for the Third World Conference at Lund. These reports stressed the question of Church unity in the relationship of Christ to the Church. The First Assembly at Amsterdam four years before had stated that God's purpose is reconciliation, a purpose "made manifest in Jesus Christ - His incarnation, His ministry of service, His death on the Cross, His resurrection and ascension."[2] The delegates at this assembly recognized that although much in this purpose was hidden, nevertheless it was perfectly plain that "All we need to know concerning God's purpose is already revealed in Christ."[1] It is the will of God that the Gospel be proclaimed to all men everywhere and it is the Church's task to make this proclamation. So the relationship of the Word of God Incarnate to His Church needs to be explored.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 235.

[2] "The Church's Witness to God's Design," Report of Section Two, Man's Disorder and God's Design, p. 212.

Lund spoke of the incarnation, death and resurrection in relation to the entrance of Christ into unity with man who is alienated saying that through Jesus Christ "God has given to lost humanity a new beginning."[2] Jesus Christ has "brought the ungodly powers to nought, and has given us freedom."[3] Christians share the New Testament affirmation of faith in Jesus as Lord and Saviour in which "common faith allows for certain differences of interpretation and practice."[4] The differing practices were easy to see in the life of the Church's order, but the differences of interpretation were much more subtle and harder to catalogue.

The relationship of Church unity to the unity of mankind was a question that demanded greater attention, especially since the merger of the Faith and Order Movement

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] "Christ and His Church," Report of Section Two, The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, pp. 236-237.

[3] Ibid., p. 236.

[4] "Continuity and Unity," Report of Section Three, The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 255.

XUM

with the Life and Work Movement in 1948 to form the World Council of Churches. Lausanne had provided a forum and a focus for the churches to exchange witness and beliefs about Church doctrine and practice. Lund recognized that it was time for the churches to put comparative explanations aside and to attempt to reach agreement. The threats and obstacles to unity presented by non-theological factors was recognized as formidable, but the stress on unity was made in exploring the relationship of Jesus Christ to the Church. The cataloguing of agreements and disagreements was by-passed at Lund and it was decided to initiate biblical study about Christ's relationship to His Church, expecting thereby to be able to find common agreement through biblical scholarship. The doctrine of the Lordship of Christ includes both His Lordship over the world as well as the Church, and this relationship was not without some influence on the relationship of the churches among themselves.

The Evanston Assembly, recognizing that the unity of the Church is grounded on the Incarnation, declared that "all history is brought under this authority,"[1] and "the unity of the Church even now is a foretaste of

---

[1] "Our Oneness in Christ and Our Disunity as Churches," Report of Section One, The Evanston Report, ed. by Willem A. Visser't Hooft (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), pp. 83-84.

XUM

the fulness that is to be because it already is."[1] And so the Church can work without ceasing and look for the day when God will sum up all things in Christ. The Assembly delegates also reinforced the Incarnation as the basis of unity by reminding the churches that Christ is Lord over the Church and "by possessing our 'church' for ourselves"[2] there is danger of sin. The Church must be viewed through Christ's Lordship.

New Delhi spoke of the unity shared "in the Church of Jesus Christ, who is before all things and in whom all things hold together."[3] In Christ alone "given by the Father to the head of the Body, the Church has its true unity,"[4] and it is in Jesus Christ that man has union with God, which union is "a mystery which passes our understanding and defeats our efforts to express it adequately."[5] The preparation for the Fourth Conference on Faith and Order revealed the widening scope of the quest for unity in relation to the Incarnation and the Lordship of Christ. The concern had spread for Church unity to the unity of mankind and the Lordship of Christ over the Church to the Lordship of Christ over all creation. It was asserted that "the Lord of the Church not only is to be the Lord of the whole creation: *he already is this*,[1] and that "the Church must be understood in respect to the creation and not only in respect to man's redemption.[2] It was evident that in order to understand the nature of Church unity, it was necessary to relate it to the unity of Christ and the unity of mankind, and to understand Jesus Christ and His role in creation it was necessary to explore the motives of the Incarnation. This exploration led some to say that "the Incarnation belongs to the predestined order of things - to wit - that God would have acted thus, even if man had not sinned, for only so could he fulfill his purpose in creation,"[3] and to view the fall and sin of man as *O Felix culpa*, *quae talem et tantum*, *meruit habere Redemptorem*.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 84.

[2] Ibid., p. 88.

[3] "Unity," Report of the Sections, in The New Delhi Report, p. 116.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] Ibid., pp. 117-118.

i. The Decisive Act

The Montreal Conference confirmed this theme. It was seen that a Christian understanding of the world was needed if the Lordship of Christ was to be examined thoroughly. The delegates spoke of the Church being founded supremely in the "decisive act in the incarnation,"[1] but elaborated little on the nature of the Incarnation itslef beyond stating that, "In this Person, this history and this work, God was Christ, reconciling the world to himself."[2] The members of the Commission at the Aarhus meeting remarked that, "the Faith and Order studies on Christology have shown the need for a fully Trinitarian perspective and for serious dealing with the meaning of creation."[3]

---

[1] "Christ and His Church," in *Faith and Order Findings*, p. 23.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 31.

[3] *Loc*. *cit*.

[4] *Loc*. *cit*.

The Report "God in Nature and History," given at Bristol, presented the thought that the theory of evolution has been used as the basis for a materialistic ideology. The Report sought to find a new and better relationship between the Christian Message and the modern view of life and of the world."[4] The Incarnation, then, the event of Jesus Christ in His Passion, death and resurrection, is viewed as a new disclosure giving meaning to past events. The Report says, "The crucified and risen Jesus of Nazareth is the key to the understanding of the meaning of the whole created world,"[1] and Christ is "the new Man who leads the process of history to its ultimate goal."[2] It is the world that "will be recreated according to the new humanity of the risen Christ."[3]

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," Report of Section One, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 44.

[2] "The Redemptive Work of Christ and the Ministry of the Church," Report of Section Three, ibid., p. 63.

[3] Minutes of the Meetings, Aarhus, p. 44.

[4] "God in Nature and History," in New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 8.

ii. Motive of the Incarnation

The Report speaks of the traditional argument in Christian theology about the motive of the Incarnation. The majority of theologians believe that the only motive was that of redeeming a sinful and fallen mankind. As the report puts it, these theologians view the Incarnation as "a great emergency measure."[4] The minority, however, have seen Christ as more than Redeemer. He is seen as the culmination of Creation; the New Man for whom creation has been waiting from the very beginning. The Report favors the Scotist view of the Incarnation because this view gives a more satisfactory explanation of the three passages in the New Testament which speak of Jesus as the Mediator of Creation.[5]

Since Teilhard placed great emphasis on the cosmic aspect of Christology and developed it in accord with the theory of Scotus, the Report has great significance for

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 12.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 13.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 27.

[4] Ibid., p. 13.

[5] *Loc*. *cit*.

XUM

this present study of Teilhard and Faith and Order. The stage for the Bristol Report had been set at the New Delhi Assembly by the address of Joseph Sittler concerning the direction of church unity. He believed that in regard to unity "the way forward is from Christology expanded to its cosmic dimensions."[1] In a remark that could certainly be labeled "Teilhardian," Sittler said that Christ "is not only the matrix and _prius_ of all things; he is the intention, the fullness, and the integrity of all things."[2] For Sittler "a doctrine of redemption is meaningful only when it swings within the larger orbit of a doctrine of creation."[3] This is precisely the view of Teilhard also.

The Faith and Order Commission at its Bristol Conference decided to pursue its study on the unity of the Church in the wider context of the study of the unity of mankind and the unity of creation. The Report of the Assembly Committee voiced its agreement with this decision at the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala.[4] In his address delivered to the assembly at Uppsala, Dr. Hendrikus Berkof said of the theme adopted by the Central Committee in 1962,[1] "Christ is final, not that evolution has terminated, but that evolution is now within Christ's final word."[2] This statement is an accurate summation of Teilhard de Chardin's entire perspective in regard to the Incarnation.

---

[1] Joseph A. Sittler, "Called to Unity," _The Ecumenical Review_, 14 (January, 1962), p. 186.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 177.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 178.

[4] "Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order," _The Uppsala Report_, p. 223.

(1) Body of Christ

In speaking of the Nature of the Church, the delegates at the Lausanne Conference stated that the task of the Church is to witness to the redeeming power of the Gospel, and this witness is to be given by the Church's life and its word. Recognizing that the Church is not constituted by the consent or belief of men, but by the will of God and that the Holy Spirit is the life of the Church and Jesus Christ is the Head, they said, "The Church as the communion of believers in Christ Jesus is, according to the New Testament, the people of the New Covenant; the Body of Christ,...[3] Just as there is but one Christ and one life in Him, so there can be only one Church, a Church which is holy, catholic and apostolic."[4] There were differences in

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Central Committee, Minutes and Reports of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, Paris, 1962, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1962), p. 15.

[2] Summary of the General Session on "The Finality of Jesus Christ," July 6, 1968, in The Uppsala Report, p. 116.

[3] "The Nature of the Church," Report of Section Three, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 463.

[4] Ibid., p. 464.

XUM

agreement about the Nature of the visible and invisible Church and their relation to each other, but there was agreement that the Church is the Body of Christ and determination to show forth the life of the one body to the world.

The Edinburgh Report echoed the statement of Lausanne and declared that, "We agree that the Church is the Body of Christ,"[1] and its function is to proclaim the gospel to all men and to build up the bond of fellowship among believers. Edinburgh set forth as the goal of its endeavors to "realise the ideal of the Church as one living body worshipping and serving God in Christ, as the fulfilment of our Lord's prayers and of our prayer,"[2] and Edinburgh further spoke of "the fundamental faith that the Church is the body of Christ."[3] It was this unity belonging to the body of Christ that led the delegates to see church federation as an approach to more complete forms of unity. The Church is one in ideal and in principle because it is the body of Christ. Cooperative actions among the churches could not be the final-goal of the Faith and Order Movement because it would not of

---

[1] "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ," Chapter II, The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 226.

[2] "The Church's Unity in Life and Worship," Chapter VI, ibid., p. 250.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

itself be sufficient to manifest the Church's unity given in Christ.

(2) Christ and the Church

Amsterdam strongly re-affirmed the fact that what was drawing the churches together was a concern for the Church in which concern the churches could discover their unity in relation to the Head of the Body, Jesus Christ. This First Assembly pointed out painfully to the churches their deepest differences, but drew confidence from the fact that the Church is the Body of Christ, and "The Body of Christ is a unity which makes it impossible for us either to forget each other or to be content with agreement upon isolated parts of our belief whilst we leave the other parts unreconciled."[1]

The Central Committee at Rolle was aware of the possibility that the search for Church unity could become an introspective search with ecclesiastical preoccupation overshadowing the object of the Church's mission, the world. The revealed purpose of God is to sum up all things in Christ, and the Church is called to mission. Only a return to Christ can overcome the division in thought and in practice between Church and Mission. Unity and Mission must always go together, for God "has made us members in the Body of Christ, and that means that we are both members one of another and also committed thereby to partnership in His redeeming mission."[1] Lund concurred with this by saying that "the Church is called to continue the Mission of Jesus Christ to the world, so that the way of Christ is the way of His Church,"[2] and even more strongly by stating that "Christ is never without His Church; the Church is never without Christ. Both belong inseparably together..."[3] Belief in Jesus Christ means belief in the Church as the Body of Christ.[4]

---

[1] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, p. 207.

The delegates at Lund, however, were well aware that even though they could say, "We are all agreed in understanding the Church as the Body of Christ, not only as a mere metaphor, but as expressing a deep spiritual reality,"[5] still the emphasis on the mode of participation of the members in Christ differed among the churches. The continuity of the Church must be examined in the light of the nature of the relationship between Jesus Christ and

---

[1] "The Calling of the Church to Mission and to Unity," Statement Received by the Central Committee at Rolle, 1951, in *A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement*, ed. by Lukas Vischer (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1963), p. 177.

[2] "Christ and His Church," Report of the First Section on the Church, in *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 237.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

[5] "Report of the Second Section on the Church," *ibid.*, p. 248.

XUM

His Church. Some emphasized the connection between the Head of the Body and the members, stressing the fact that the Church has received the fulness of Christ. Others gave priority to the sovereignty of Christ over the members of His Body and looked to the Second Coming of Christ in glory when Christ in His fulness will be revealed. In this case emphasis on either aspect influences the nature of the continuity of the Church. There may be unity in the Body of Christ but there are serious divisions as well. The concept and the reality of the Body of Christ, while a source and ground of unity, still need further examination as the churches recognized their unity but sought also to manifest it.

(3) Montreal

The Montreal Conference believed that it was "helpful to think not in terms of the churches as parts of the one Church, but rather of the Church as the Body of Christ..."[1] and that every gathering of the congregation to proclaim the Word of God and offer the Eucharist is "a manifestation of the whole Catholic Church in the very process of becoming what she is in service and witness to the world."[2] Montreal affirmed that "The Church is the 'new creation' precisely as the body of the crucified-risen

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," in The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 45.

[2] Ibid., p. 46.

Lord."[1] The emphasis now to view Christ and His relation to creation, for any discussion of the universality of the Church or of its uniqueness demanded that the Church's relationship to the world be considered. The report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church stated that, "we cannot speak of the Church in relation to the world without first speaking of Christ and his relation both to the world viewed as the totality of God's creation and to the 'world' viewed as hostile to God,"[2] that is, the fallen world of sin and death under the rule of Satan as the New Testament speaks of it. In his relationship to man, according to the report, "Christ takes to himself the humanity which belongs to all men, and in his living and dying he makes the suffering and the need of all mankind his own."[3] The Incarnation of Christ and the Church as His Body are now explored in a context wider than that of Church unity. The method for pursuing a common Christology by scriptural studies recommended by the Lund Conference led the delegates at Montreal to recognize the need for a hermeneutical principle. The eschatological dimension was raised again at Montreal and yet the notion of the Church as a new creation, and the Lord as Lord of all creation demanded that the churches examine the relationship of Church and world to correct "a spirituality that divorces God from earth and its possibilities."[1] At Edinburgh the churches recognized and expressed the need for a Christological basis in pursuit of Church unity. Lund saw Christology as the means to a deeper expression of the unity of the Church. Christology was emphasized as the basis for a common ecclesiology. The emphasis shifted from a study of the nature of the Church itself to an examination of the relationship between Christ and the Church. Christology became the central area of study as the comparative methodology yielded to the dialectical. Lund discovered that more than doctrine divided the churches and with the recognition of the profound effects of non-theological factors on Church unity, a focus on Christology offered a more accessible hope of success. Montreal revealed the need for exploring more completely the cosmic dimension of Christology and the relationship of the Church and Christ to all of mankind.

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," ibid., p. 42.

[2] "Christ and His Church," in Faith and Order Findings, p. 23.

[3] Loc. cit.

When the Faith and Order Commission met at Aarhus the year following the Montreal Conference, it was evident that there was renewed interest to pursue God's action in creation. There was more stress placed on Christ and His relationship to creation than on the Church as the

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," in _The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order_, p. 44.

Body of Christ. The Faith and Order personnel felt obliged "to seek a new and better relationship between the Christian message and the modern view of life and of the world."[1]

It was not only to the modern world that Faith and Order had to relate, but to other world religions, especially the Jews. The persecutions of the Jews during the 1930's and 1940's and the emergence of the State of Israel after World War II presented the churches with new theological problems. Bristol recognized that "a new dimension of Faith and Order and a new conception of its task is inescapable. Unity is seen as involving man in creation and in history."[2] Bishop Tomkins questioned whether the starting point was to lie in the particularity of the history of Israel or from a theology of the natural.[3] The Faith and Order Commission report submitted at Bristol on the Church and the Jewish People recognized that, "If the main emphasis is put on the concept of the Church as the body of Christ, the Jewish people are seen as being outside...If, on the other hand, the Church is primarily seen as the people of God, it is possible to regard the Church and the Jewish people together as forming the one people of God, separated from one another for the time being, yet with the promise that they will ultimately become one."[1] This relationship of the Church to the Jewish people promises to be an area of great concern in the years ahead for Faith and Order, and could greatly modify the concept of the Church as the body of Christ, for the report believes that, "the Church must be thought of both as the body of Christ and as the people of God, and these two concepts express the one reality from different angles."[2] This demands a continuing search.

---

[1] Minutes of the Meetings, Aarhus, p. 8.

[2] "The Future of Faith and Order Work," closing address by Dr. Oliver S. Tomkins, Bishop of Bristol, in New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 163.

[3] Loc. cit.

The Faith and Order Movement, then, in the continuing quest for unity and in its exploration of the nature and meaning of the Incarnation, finds itself facing the important question of the motive of the Incarnation. The study document, "God and Nature in History," presented to the Commission at Bristol, endorsed the minority Scotist view of the Incarnation maintaining that consummation is a higher work than creation, and that Christ is leading history to its final goal.

4. Scotus and the Incarnation

Since both Teilhard and Faith and Order involve themselves with the view of Duns Scotus, it would be well

---

[1] "The Church and the Jewish People," in New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 76.

[2] Loc, cit.

XUM

to set forth the Scotist view of the Incarnation. Duns Scotus sets forth his teaching on the motive of the Incarnation in the Reportata Parisiensis 3, 7, 4-6, which bears the date 1307, and so is to be considered one of his later works. Scotus recognized that the Church Fathers appear to view the only goal of the Incarnation as the reparation of the sin of Adam. This view, too, was also the view of Thomas Aquinas who believed that the unique purpose of the Incarnation was redemption from sin. Thomas says in the Summa Theologia:

> Hence, since everywhere in the Sacred Scripture the sin of the first man is assigned as the reason of the Incarnation, it is more in accordance with this to say that the work of the Incarnation was ordained by God as a remedy for sin; so that, had sin not existed, the Incarnation would not have been. And yet the power of God is not limited to this; even had sin not existed, God could have become incarnate.[1]

Scotus, however, would not accept a teaching which would make the Fall of Man a cause of so great an event as the Incarnation. He says:

> Dico tamen quod lapsus non fuit causa praedestinationis Christi...Item, si lapsus esset causa praedestinationis Christi, sequeretur quod summum opus Dei esset occasionatum tantum.[2]

The work of the Incarnation was God's crowning achievement. Scotus refused to accept it as a result of

---

[1] Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologia III, i, 3., Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd., 1924), p. 12.

[2] Joannis Duns Scoti, Tomus Vigesimus Tertius (Parisiis: Apud Ludovicum Vives), MDCCCXCIV, p. 303.

XUM

an occasion or condition. He believed that the predestination of Christ was entirely independent of the predestination of all other creatures. For Scotus, God's choice was that he be loved by one who could love him supremely and "Praevidit unionem illius naturae, quae debet eum summa diligere, etsi nullus cecidisset."[1] For Scotus there is a secondary goal of the Incarnation, brought about by man's fall and superadded to the primary divine determination. Scotus says, "Vidit mediatorem venientem passurum et redempturum, populum suum, et non venisset ut mediator, ut passurus ut redempturus, nisi aliquis prius pecasset."[2] Scotus does not mean to imply that God in some way had to amend His original plan, adding something new to it, nor does he seek to resolve directly the question whether God would have become incarnate if man had not sinned. P. Raymond tells us that, "Il se maintient dans l'ordre des réalités voulués par Dieu et prouve que, là, le motif de l'incarnation du Verbe n'est et ne saurait être le péché d'Adam."[3] In this, Scotus and Thomas Aquinas agree; that discussion should begin from what God has actually effected in the present order of created reality.

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] P. Raymond, "Duns Scot," in Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, ed. by A. Vacant, Tome Quatrième (Paris, VI: Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1924), p. 1891.

i. Bristol

The framers of the Bristol Report, in speaking of the arguments put forth by those who hold to this Scotist view, state that, "the consequence drawn is that Christ would have come anyway, apart from the fall and sin,"[1] and declare that "although the question was usually treated in this manner, this is an unhappy way of posing the question, because it presupposes something unreal."[2] In this, both Thomas and Scotus would concur, and neither of them posed the question precisely in this way.

The emphasis of Scotus was to assign the central place in creation to Jesus Christ. The Incarnation was effected to unify all reality in the Word Incarnate and is viewed as designed to have taken place apart from the Fall of Man and his need of redemption. For Scotus, the Incarnation is part of God's creative plan from the very beginning. One would have to say that all reality, then, exists for the sake of Christ rather than to say that Christ exists for all reality. The priority is given to Christ as the first-born of all creatures in whom all things adhere. His role as Redeemer receives secondary emphasis.

The orthodoxy of this position has never been questioned, although this view of the motive of the Incarnation has never been considered as the viewpoint of most theologians. Teilhard has only one explicit reference to the Scotist position,[1] but there is no doubt that this is the position he finds most compatible with his cosmic viewpoint. There is, however, a significant modification given to this theological position by the evolutionary perspective of Teilhard, a modification which is to influence greatly the emphasis of Teilhard and which is to be the source of severe criticism by some of his interpreters.[2] Scotus, writing in the fourteenth century, was the inheritor of a vision of a static universe, a universe which would allow him to consider the Incarnation as an end in itself. For Teilhard, attempting to rethink and interpret the mystery of Christ in terms of genèse, emphasis had to be shifted from the motive of the Incarnation to the work of the Incarnate Word.

---

[1] "God in Nature and History," New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 13.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

ii. Re-creation

Mooney points out, in speaking of Teilhard's system of cosmogenesis, "it is this context which forces him to shift the point at issue from the primary motive of the Incarnation to the primary motive of the redemption."[1] This primary emphasis must fall on the work of Christ, and the Scriptures reveal that this work is the work of salvation. Christ must be seen as the goal of creation, but in his role of savior. Teilhard's dynamic, evolutionary view of reality, quite different from the view of Scotus, necessitates this change in view of the Incarnation, and the shift in emphasis from reality to process. The world is still being created, and the goal of creation is Christ who is saving.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Outline of a Dialectic of Spirit," in Activation of Energy, p. 150.

[2] This modification and its consequences are thoroughly treated in Mooney's Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, pp. 120-145.

If emphasis then must, in the first place, be given to the work of Christ, which is the work of salvation, the question facing Teilhard is whether salvation consists primarily in the elevation of created reality or primarily in reparation for sin. Scotus, working within a static system, could consider human nature of Christ in an abstract, philosophical way. Teilhard, because of his evolutionary framework, views the human nature of Christ within the evolutionary process. In this process of evolution, suffering and death, both physical evil, are inevitable. The Word of God, by becoming man and assuming a human nature, inevitably participates in suffering and death which is the lot of all men, and by His Resurrection overcomes these evils and redeems mankind. The painful weight and price of human progress have been borne by Christ and suffering and death have been conquered. This positive aspect of redemption, the support given to man's advance by Christ's suffering, death, and Resurrection, is the aspect stressed by Teilhard. It is the ultimate assurance that man can reach the goal of union with God. Jesus is the bearer of the good news of salvation and re-creation.

---

[1] Mooney, *ibid*., p. 121.

It is this aspect of Christ's redemptive work that Teilhard emphasized. Yet the negative aspect of redemption, that of reparation for sin, is neglected by Teilhard.

iii. Reparation

The Incarnation of Christ can in no way be considered apart from sin and the Fall of Man. The concept of reparation, following upon Christ's atoning death and his resurrection demands a prominent place in theological speculation.

The traditional scholastic understanding of reparation offers the explanation that redemption is redemption from sin. Man sinned, became alienated from God, and remained a sinner. The loss was irreparable and man could do nothing on his own to heal the breach. He could do nothing to make satisfaction to God for the offense committed against him. The effect of the suffering and death of Jesus was to redeem mankind by repairing the breach and bringing about a reconciliation between God and man. Christ redeems man by offering infinite satisfaction for the sins of the world. He makes reparation to the goodness and holiness of God offended by sin.

Christ has conquered not only physical evil, but moral evil as well. Through obedience to the will of His Father, in perfect love, he has overcome man's refusal to love. Teilhard recognizes that Christ has borne the weight of man's refusal to love, and in his system, he views moral evil precisely as man's refusal to love. Man has freedom to refuse to love, yet growth, for man, comes only through love, so man's refusal to unite himself in love is the only obstacle which can block the ascendancy of the spirit. Suffering and death can be transfigured only through love. Sin is a refusal to love. Yet Teilhard has little to say about this aspect of redemption, reparation for sin. Mooney, in fact, states that, "there is no emphasis at all."[1] Teilhard's treatment of this negative aspect of redemption tends to be strongly impersonal and sin is depersonalized. Creation is emphasized, reparation practically vanishes.

It is Mooney's belief that this significant omission was caused by Teilhard's fear that emphasis on reparation, arising from the traditional view of original sin, would obscure the cosmic dimension of Christ's salvific work. He wanted to establish firmly the role of Christ as Redeemer and the role of man's cooperation in this redemption. He believed that all of creation was to be redeemed and therefore all creation somehow shared in the fall. He felt that the traditional concept of original sin was inadequate to safeguard the totality of Christ's redemptive work and to bring all of creation under Christ's redemptive influence. He wanted to keep original sin as large as the world.[1]

---

[1] Mooney, ibid., p. 123.

iv. Secular Values

Teilhard also believed that the principal reason for modern man's refusal to embrace Christianity was the Christian's neglect of the world and secular values. And he believed that a narrow vision of original sin, a view emphasizing solely its historical and personal character led to an inordinate stress on reparation for sin and neglected the positive aspect of Christ's redemption. This, Teilhard believed, was responsible for the withdrawal of Christians from the world's affairs, a mistrust of progress, and a lack of interest in aspirations that are purely human.[2] He wanted

---

[1] Cf., "Note on the Universal Christ," 1920, in Science and Christ, p. 15.

"Fall, Redemption and Geocentricism," 1920, in Christianity and Evolution, trans. by René Hague (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969), p. 38.

"Note on Some Historic Representations of Original Sin," 1924, ibid., p. 48.

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 137.

XUM

to see original sin in terms of a progress rather than a fall. For Teilhard, man was not a finished product, and he could not view original sin in a framework that he believed was incompatible with an evolutionary view.

5. Summary

i. Question Facing Faith and Order

Lausanne had built its hopes for unity on the Incarnation and this is still the hope and basis of unity among the Churches today. The Church is the body of Christ and sees its unity in relation to Christ, its Head. The progress of Faith and Order Studies has led it from comparative ecclesiology to Christology. The study of Christology has continued but the context is an ever-widening one. It is seen that the Church must be understood in relation to creation as well as redemption. The scope has widened as Faith and Order explores Christ's lordship over all creation as well as his lordship over the Church. The pressing concerns of the world filled with disorder and injustice demanding an exploration of the life and work of the Church in society pose penetrating questions to the Churches in search of unity. Montreal expressed the problem precisely when it asked: "If Christ was Flesh and Word and if he is to be the Lord of all creation, how can we, his followers, so often flee into a spirituality that

XUM

divorces God from earth and its possibilities."[1] The Conference on Church and Society attempted to explore the question and the Church's responsibility in the world. This was reflected in the Uppsala assembly.

(1) Uppsala

The Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches held at Uppsala in 1968, following the direction strongly indicated by the Conference on Church and Society held at Geneva two years earlier, focused on the responsibility of the Churches to Society. It took as its theme "Behold, I make all things new." The Church's role in the world and the growing concern for the developing nations were factors consistently influencing Faith and Order studies. From the beginning the task of Faith and Order had been to promote unity among the Churches, and those theological problems which were responsible for serious division in the Church received priority. But as the new questions were raised the task was widened. There were theological questions which reflected differences of opinion and yet which cut across confessional lines, such questions as the meaning of Christ's Lordship, the relationship between redemption and creation and the question of God's activity in history and how it is expressed. Ecclesiological studies were not abandoned, but the program of Faith and Order was extended with the growing recognition that the search for unity demands more than merely dealing with the past. Past differences, resulting in present ecclesial postures, are seen in a new light when examined within the context of such questions as the relation of Creation, New Creation, and Church unity, or the theme of God and Man in nature and history.

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," Report of Section One, in The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 44.

(2) Horizontal or Vertical

In assessing the reactions to the Uppsala assembly, Albert H. van den Heuvel noted that, "Two comments are made by everybody: The Assembly turned the churches towards the needs of the world and the Assembly as an event was ambiguous."[1] It was the world-centered focus of Uppsala that drew so much criticism from man and so much praise from others. Metropolitan Meliton described the central theological problem facing the delegates in this way:

> Should they move in a vertical direction, aiming mainly and in the first place at conversion, rebirth and the fulfilment of man in Christ? Or in a horizontal direction, in activistic style, aiming at the curing of evils in the world, the betterment of the conditions of human life, and the creation of a moral order of things on this earth?[2]

Dr. Hendrikus Berkhof supported this presentation of the problem.[1] The Personal Comment on the Work of the Section on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church reveal that the severest criticism of the draft document came from the Orthodox: "Fears were repeatedly expressed of a false dichotomy or confusion between some secular, 'horizontal' notion of catholicity and the unity given by and in Christ."[2] There were Lutherans, too, who warned against "confusing God's saving work with his general work in history and against the demonic element in 'secular catholicity'."[3] Those delegates, classified generally as "verticalists" held as their primary concern, the millions of people who had not heard or had not accepted the Word of Christ. The "horizontalists" were concerned with the deprived, the poverty-stricken, and the oppressed and asked that the task of the Church be seen as concerning itself with this earth. In speaking of this issue between these two positions, Dr. Berkhof commented that, "every conference seems anew to find its participants insufficiently prepared for this main issue."[4]

---

[1] Albert H. van den Heuvel, "Survey of Press Comments. Reactions to the Fourth Assembly," The Ecumenical Review, XXI, 1 (January, 1969), p. 32.

[2] *Art. cit.*, p. 49.

These two positions, obviously manifest in the

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] John Weller, "Personal Comment on the Work of the Section on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church," in *The Uppsala Report*, p. 19.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] A. H. van den Heuvel, "Survey of Press Comments," p. 49.

Section on the Catholicity of the Church, were just as evident in the Section on Mission. The Discussion of the Report on Renewal in Mission reveals that many felt there was more concern for poverty and physical hunger than for spiritual hunger, and that the primary missionary responsibility of the Church was to confront mankind with the good news of Jesus Christ and to preach repentance and remission of sin.[1] Professor Skydsgaard focused directly

---

[1] The following comments published in The Uppsala Report are indicative of this concern:

> "Discussion of the Report on Renewal in Mission:
>
> 'Dr. R. G. Mayfield, Delegate (Methodist Church, U.S.A.) missed any reference to our Lord's command that we are to proclaim the Good News and preach repentance and forgiveness of sin.' (p. 25)
>
> 'Dr. J. R. Chandran, Delegate (Church of South India) thought the report should bring out more clearly the missionary responsibility to confront men and women with the good news of Jesus Christ, calling them to repentance, faith and personal commitment to the Lord.' (p. 25)
>
> 'The Rev. J. R. W. Stott, Adviser (Church of England) did not find in the report any concern for the spiritual hunger of man comparable to that which had been expressed regarding physical hunger and poverty.'" (p. 26)
>
> Both Sir Kenneth Grubb, Delegate of the Church of England and the Rev. R. Buana Kibongi, Delegate of the Evangelical Church of the Congo, agreed with Mr. Stott.
>
> "Discussion of the Report on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church:
>
> 'For the first time in an official WCC document the second dimension of catholicity was mentioned explicitly, namely, that the measure of our unity is conditioned by the contribution of the churches

on the problem when he asked:

> whether in this paper it had been said clearly and explicitly that according to Holy Scripture the holy apostolic mission, the very core of mission, remained the proclamation of the uncontained and unlimited mercy and love of God to men, his forgiveness for all guilt and sin. If this was not said, all that had been said would not meet the deepest need and hunger of us all.[1]

The Personal Comments on the Work of the Section on Renewal in Mission summed up the tension as follows: "The restrictive and limited definition of mission as the proclamation of the saving word of Christ's redemption met the modern and still not well-defined concept of mission as 'discovering God's action in the world.'"[2] Dr. Sovik also reported that "the tendency toward identification of God's creative and providential action with his redemption was opposed by those who held that if the two could not be separated they must in any event be distinguished."[3]

In appealing for acceptance of the final draft on Renewal in Mission, John Coventry Smith voiced the opinion that at this time there is no common understanding of the nature of the Church's mission or of the way it is to be

---

to the unity and catholicity of the world.'" (p. 10)

[1] "Discussion of the Report on Renewal in Mission," The Uppsala Report, p. 26.

[2] The Rev. Dr. Arne Sovik, "Personal Comment on the Work of the Section on Renewal in Mission," The Uppsala Report, p. 38.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

implemented.[1] These questions are items for the continuing agenda. Uppsala made an attempt to combine the two viewpoints of the horizontalists and the verticalists but failed to find a solution to the problem. Dr. Berkhof reflects that, "It must be possible in the Fifth Assembly, if not to solve the problems, at any rate to dig more deeply into the differences and to bring the groups closer together."[2]

The Report on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church seems to reflect the Scotist priority of the view of Incarnation when it states the meaning of the Catholicity of the Church as, "this given reality of grace in which the purpose of creation is restored and sinful men are reconciled in the one divine sonship of which Christ is both author and finisher."[3] Teilhard would surely concur with this ordering of entities, first restoration and then reconciliation.

ii. Teilhard's Contribution

If Teilhard were to respond to the question raised by Faith and Order at Bristol, "Has the Incarnation

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] A. H. van den Heuvel, "Survey of Press Comments," p. 49.

[3] "The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church," in The Uppsala Report, p. 18.

XUM

any meaning apart from the fall and sin...?",[1] he would assert that it has. Traditional Thomistic theology established a strong distinction between the order of redemption and that of creation. In God's original plan, the Incarnation was not envisioned. It followed only upon the sin of man. If man had not sinned then the Incarnation would not have happened. It was not within the original plan of creation. In this sense the order of creation is fundamentally independent of the Incarnation. God created the universe without any connection with the Incarnation. There is a moral and juridical bond between the universe and Christ and Christ has a place only within sinful humanity. Teilhard, however, rejected this theological view and identified much more closely with that of Scotus, although his Scotistic interpretation was placed in an evolutionary context which modified it considerably. For Teilhard, following Scotus' view, the Incarnation was contained in God's original plan. Christ has a central place in the universe, not morally or juridically, but intrinsically. All of creation was centered on him from the beginning and the Fall of man introduced an accidental modification in God's creative plan, not a substantial one. Christ would have come if the Fall had not occurred. Christ is the crown and end of all creation, now he is also Redeemer. So the Incarnation has profound meaning apart from the fall and sin. It centers the world on Christ and not Christ on the world, a difference of perspective which has great bearing on Teilhard's spirituality and his view of Christ, Church and World. The Incarnation is also man's ultimate assurance that he can reach union with God, for in taking a human nature upon himself, Jesus in suffering and dying overcomes these evils by his Resurrection. By this redemptive work, Jesus guarantees an outcome for the human species and gives impetus to build the earth.

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church," Report of Section I, New Directions in Faith and Order, Appendix III, p. 130.

By accepting this view of the Incarnation, Teilhard reinforced his view that no true Christian spirituality can divorce God from the earth and its possibilities or allow man to reject the building of earth. His response to the question raised by Faith and Order at Montreal would be that a spirituality that divorces God from the earth and its possibilities is not a truly Christian spirituality. It was his opinion that undue stress on reparation for sin, based on a too narrow view of original sin, led to this anomaly and that only a reversal of the negative and positive aspects of redemption would restore a balance to Christian spirituality. Such a reversal would allow man to be committed to the things of earth. It would move him to cooperate in building the earth and enable him to share in creation. Man's primary function would be

XUM

creative and positive. He could welcome progress and develop human aspirations. Christians, then, would not view the world as something to be shunned, but as a task to be embraced and completed. By stressing the centrality of Christ in creation and emphasizing positive redemption Teilhard hoped to manifest the organic and physical relationship of Christ and the world, believing that this was more fruitful than a moral and juridical relationship. Christ was central to creation and the body of Christ is organic, not metaphysical.

Teilhard's motives for stressing the positive aspect of redemption were undoubtedly sound, as was his hope of offering a corrective to Christianity, and a dynamic Christianity to the 'gentiles.' His acceptance of the Scotistic view of the Incarnation would seem to put him more on the side of the 'horizontalists' than the 'verticalists.' The Faith and Order report, given at Bristol, also favors a Scotist view of the Incarnation because it offers a better explanation for those passages in the New Testament which refer to Jesus as the Mediator of Creation.[1] Both Teilhard and Faith and Order share this perspective. It would be well to note, however, that in Teilhard's system of thought the neglect of reparation is a serious omission which denies a necessary balance to his overall work.

---

[1] "God in Nature and History," ibid., p. 13.

Positive redemption or re-creation, for Teilhard, means that through his Passion, Death and Resurrection, Christ has overcome the resistance to spiritual ascent which inheres in matter. But man can refuse, freely, to love. In fact, there is an inordinate capacity in man to do so. In Teilhard's own words there is "a certain disconcerting excess in the overflow of sin and suffering."[1] The one guarantee of man's success in overcoming sin on the personal level can only be the victory of Christ over this sinful capacity in man on the personal level. It is this reparation for sin by Christ that makes it possible for man to overcome sin, to grow in love, and ultimately to give assurance of the positive aspect of redemption, the restoration of all things in Christ. Neglect of sin and a downgrading of reparation calls this possibility into jeopardy.

Locked into Teilhard's system of redemption was a dependency of the 'horizontal' on the 'vertical'. By assigning a theological priority to creation over reparation, he failed to give an extended or even adequate treatment of sin. The charge, sometimes made against Teilhard that he neglected the aspect of sin in his writings or at best gives it a most inadequate treatment, is not without foundation. Teilhard's primary concern was to restore a positive, life-embracing image and function to Christianity.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 313.

He believed that sin had played too prominent and dominant a role in the Christian life to the detriment of the Christian's relationship with the world. He was fearful of the narrow approach which concentrated almost exclusively on sin and neglected the role of the Christian in the world. He saw a danger in relating the Incarnation primarily or solely to personal sin. This led Mooney to comment on "the immense irony in his inability to see that what he envisioned as a danger was in fact the only source of hope."[1] In Teilhard's system man is the key to evolution. Love is the key to man's growth as man. Love, then, is the key to evolution. Sin, man's refusal to love, can block man's evolutionary progress. Sin, as well as death, has been overcome by Christ as the concept of reparation is of central importance in any discussion of redemption. It must be effected on the realm of freedom on the personal level. Any place less significant than this is deleterious to the concept of the Incarnation and Christ's work of salvation. There is a danger that, in stressing creation and neglecting reparation, or, what is worse, in identifying the two concepts without the traditional notion of the Atonement and the stumbling block of the Cross, Christianity will be vitiated. In considering the Incarnation, Teilhard neglected the negative aspect of redemption and seriously

---

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 142.

XUM

weakened his argument for re-creation, for reparation is the re-creation of man, a re-creation which is essential as a basis for the restoration of all things in Christ. As Faith and Order treats of the Scotist view of the Incarnation and studies the relationship of the 'horizontal' and the 'vertical' in the context of a world in evolution, the Scotism of Teilhard can prove helpful in seeking the need for a balance between reparation and creation. An overemphasis on the 'horizontal' can run the risk of neutralizing evil and exalting human progress. Too exclusive an emphasis on the collective can detract substantially from the person. The victory of Christ assured through the Incarnation and Resurrection takes on a much more human aspect when it is viewed through the struggle of individual men against sin, suffering and death, and seen against the background of the Cross.

CHAPTER V

RESURRECTION AND REDEMPTION

1. Teilhard: Resurrection and Redemption

Teilhard's general viewpoint was overwhelmingly a cosmic one and this can be seen clearly in his approach to redemption. It was his starting point that "the whole world has been corrupted by the Fall and the whole of everything has been redeemed."[1] For Teilhard the collapse of the geocentric theory introduced new elements into the problem of the Fall and Redemption. Before Galileo it was easier to accept the belief that one man had spoiled everything and another had redeemed it. The revelation of the dimensions of the cosmos demands that either the theological understanding of the Fall and Redemption must be severely limited to the earth which is but a fragment of the universe, or else the believer must "completely refashion the historical representation of original sin...."[2] The emergence of the process of evolution also, in Teilhard's opinion, demanded a modification of the understanding of Redemption, and he saw that "to conform the idea of Redemption completely to the demands of evolution is a difficult task, but a liberating one."[1] Teilhard attempted to explore the meaning of Redemption in a universe profoundly expanded and in a context of evolution recently discovered, believing that Christ as Redeemer would emerge from the attempt with even greater beauty and majesty. It was this new context and this new perspective that led him to new explorations. He wanted Christ to be the Redeemer of the entire world and not just part of it. Redemption demands a fault. Cosmic redemption demands a cosmic fault. This expanded view of the universality of redemption called for a re-examination of the nature of the fault and the nature of its redemption.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Chute, Rédemption et Géocentrie," in Comment Je Crois, p. 52.

[2] Ibid., p. 51.

i. Resurrection

Teilhard saw the Resurrection of Christ as a key factor in understanding universal redemption. He viewed the Resurrection not as an isolated event which can be used apologetically to establish the truth of Christianity, but as "a tremendous cosmic event,"[2] allowing the humanity of Christ to acquire "a universal morphological function"[3] just as in living bodies one cell can gradually come to

---

[1] Teilhard, "Christologie et Évolution," ibid., p. 105.

[2] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 63.

[3] Teilhard, "Chute, Rédemption et Géocentrie," in Comment Je Crois, p. 55.

XUM

predominate in an organism. The Resurrection of Christ indicated the "effective assumption of his function as the universal centre."[1] It is an event manifesting the view that Christ now radiates over the entire universe as an activity fully in control of it. Christ, baptized into the world, has risen up from it. As Teilhard quotes, "descendit et ascendit ut implerit omnia (Eph. 4:10)"[2] Christ has not only conquered death by the Resurrection but now "nothing any longer kills inevitably but everything is capable of becoming the blessed touch of the divine hands...."[3]

(1) Bodily Nature

In regard to the resurrection of the body Teilhard, as may be expected, is more concerned with its cosmic aspects. In a universe which is converging, the resurrection of Jesus allows him to take the prominent position as center in whom all things are gathered. For Teilhard the world is still being created and Christ is bringing himself to completion in it. The ultimate salvation of individual man is made through this union with the humanity of Christ. He says, "The restoration of the flesh is a phenomenon

---

[1] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, pp. 63-64.

[2] Ibid., p. 64.

[3] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 55.

XUM

cosmic rather than individual in order,"[1] for the individual is called "to rejoin Christ and become integrated in him."[2] For Teilhard, across the reaches of space and time there is a single activity happening, "the annexation to Christ of his chosen,"[3] resulting in the formation of His Mystical Body. Each one of the chosen will see God face to face but this vision will be "vitally inseparable from the elevating and illuminating action of Christ."[4] The resurrection of the individual is seen, then in solidarity with the entire body of the chosen. The individual effort awaits its completion and its union with the efforts of all other men.

Teilhard gives a central importance to the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ although he never probes the questions raised by biblical criticism and exegesis. He neither concerns himself with the question of the historicity of the resurrection event, nor the nature of the resurrected body itself. His primary concern is to express the transforming effect of the resurrection of Jesus Christ which establishes him as the center of the universal gathering. It is the Resurrection of Jesus which allows him to become

---

[1] Teilhard, "Forma Christi," in *Writings in Time of War*, p. 268.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, p. 124.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

XUM

the omega of the evolutionary process. The Incarnation effects the humanity of Jesus. The Resurrection allows him to become the universal center of mankind.

(2) Universal in Christ

Teilhard was greatly concerned with the relationship of the material world to God even if he did not speculate on the nature of the resurrected body. He so emphasized the continuity between matter and spirit, that at times he was accused of being a materialist. Teilhard insisted strongly that theologians need to give more emphasis to the relationship between Christ and the material world, believing that it was the physical mediation of the Body of Christ which gave to evolution the impetus needed to make sense out of man's efforts to build the world. For Teilhard, Christ became organically bound to the cosmos through his incarnation. In stressing the importance of the resurrection and its significance for salvation, a significance which becomes all the more meaningful when it is seen placed against the concept of reparation that has played such a large part in traditional theology, Teilhard wants to bring out strongly "the role of the risen Christ in the divinization of man and, with man, of all creation, at least at an initial stage."[1] The resurrection, then, plays a central part in redemption, not only of man, but of all created reality. It is his basis for stating that "the eventual biological success of Man on Earth is not merely a probability, but a certainty,"[1] recognizing that since this conclusion stems from faith it is supra-phenomenal. It is a view of the Resurrection which stresses the traditional concept of universal resurrection in Christ but explores it in the context of a world in evolution.

---

[1] Rideau, _The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin_, p. 166.

ii. Redemption

(1) Cosmic Character

Teilhard believed that the dogma of the redemption wrought by Jesus Christ was for a long time concerned almost exclusively with the idea of atonement and reparation for sin. Having established through the testimony of revelation the resurrection of Jesus and its cosmic dimension, Teilhard wanted to concern himself with the problem of man's cooperation with God in building the earth and the positive re-creative aspect of redemption. He recognized that the formidable obstacle to this was moral evil and man's ability to refuse salvation and to endanger the whole process of evolution by such a refusal. Christ has come to redeem man, but Teilhard acknowledged that man is free to accept or reject Christ and the salvation he offers.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Directions and Conditions of the Future," in The Future of Man, p. 237.

XUM

In The Phenomenon of Man Teilhard admits that in spite of the fact that he has attempted to portray the positive essence of man's spiritual ascent nevertheless scientifically "it in no way follows from the position taken up here that the final success of hominization is necessary, inevitable and certain."[1] He protests that it would be to misunderstand him if one were to view his presentation as a "human idyll" rather than a "cosmic drama."[2] He states further that "complete liberty is not only conceded but offered by the phenomenon to theology, so that it may add precision and depth...,"[3] to that which is often experientially ambiguous, so he feels obliged to consider, in the light of evolution, the problem of redemption and man's freedom.

In treating of sin and redemption, Teilhard felt that the traditional form of the representation of original sin was one of the chief obstacles to progress in Christian thought. He thought it too narrow and restricting and maintained that in order to give a cosmic dimension to redemption, that which was to be redeemed must be cosmic as well. This led Teilhard to an interpretation of original sin which was to prove quite troublesome to him eventually. He wrote:

> In order to save the Christian view of Christ-Redeemer,

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 306.

[2] Ibid., p. 309.

[3] Ibid., p. 311.

> it is clearly necessary that we must maintain an original sin as vast as the world (otherwise Christ would have saved only a part of the world and would not be truly the center of all).[1]

He wanted to maintain a fault as cosmic as the Redemption, a fault which would be found in the whole of universal history. This led him to transfer his attention from the concept of man's first disobedience to an original sin larger in time and extension. This view of redemption follows from his consideration of the meaning of Christ's resurrection and his scientific knowledge of the vastness of the universe and the relatively recent emergence of man on the earth. Teilhard felt it necessary to reverse the importance of the positive and negative aspects of redemption. Teilhard was aware that modern man was taking on an increasing interest in the development of the world and that Christian humanism was becoming more of a force than ever. He believed it to be a revival "which in no way rejects the dark side of creation but would rather emphasize its luminous aspects."[2] He thought that if the notion of expiatory reparation is preserved in its integrity but receded to second place in considering the work of salvation, then this renewal in Christology would lead to an expansion of religion and would coincide and reinforce the growth of Christian optimism. This was, he believed, perfectly in keeping with the mood of modern man and would foster a humanistic renewal in religion.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Note sur quelques Représentations historiques possibles du Péché originel," in Comment Je Crois, p. 69.

[2] Teilhard, "Le Christ évoluteur," ibid., p. 171.

So Teilhard is concerned that redemption should lead in the first place to fulfilment in union with God, and secondarily to conquer the forces of evil. The primary emphasis is no longer on expiation but on creation. The newly revealed cosmic dimensions of reality demand a redeemer. In the matter of redemption "Christ is all or nothing."[1] So to safeguard the universality of Christ, he thought it necessary to extend redemption to the whole universe and not simply to man.

Teilhard saw the Fall of Man, not as an isolated event, but as a general condition which extended to and affected the whole of history. He credited a narrow view of original sin with influencing Christians to adopt a perspective leading to a mistrust or an underestimate of progress. He believed that it was this rejection of the world and its progress which was responsible for the rise of modern Atheism. In stressing the cosmic character of redemption and the act of creation over that of reparation, Teilhard de-emphasized the personal element in original sin and this de-emphasis left him open to criticism from a number of theologians. His cosmic perspective, however,

---

[1] Teilhard, "Chute, Redémption et Géocentrie, *ibid*., p. 57.

XUM

did allow him a great measure of Christian optimism, and a zest for building the world which found a response in a world concerned with development.

(2) Relation to Creation

It was Teilhard's hope that his theology of redemption would be responsive to the needs of modern man for it gave importance to positive redemption and the victory over the forces of evil. It stresses man's part in the ongoing redemptive process and allows for greater human participation in the redemption of the world. For Teilhard creation is continuing and there is a continuity in God's plan for mankind. The Incarnation, the Resurrection, and Redemption are so intimately linked together with God's creative plan, that the mystery of creation cannot be understood without understanding these mysteries as intimately related and without understanding them as mysteries in process. As he said, Christianity is becoming aware that

> its three fundamental personalist mysteries are in reality simply the three aspects of one and the same process (Christogenesis)considered either in its motive principle (Creation) or its unifying mechanism (Incarnation) or in its uplifting work (Redemption)...[1]

These three mysteries "become in truth no more, for the new Christology, than three aspects of the same fundamental process of a fourth mystery...the mystery of the Creative

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction à la Vie chretienne," ibid., p. 183.

Union of the World in God, or Pleromization."[1]

Teilhard believed that these three mysteries have traditionally remained logically independent of one another, but if transposed from a static cosmos to one in evolution they seem to form one mystery. For God, to create is to unite himself to his work which is to involve himself in the world by incarnation to redeem it. As Teilhard recognizes "Creation entail(s)...a certain immersion of the Creator in his work and at the same time...a certain redemptive compensation."[2] For Teilhard the history of salvation begins with creation. Redemption is universal redemption linked to creation. Christ is at work unifying all things in Himself through his redeeming activity.

When put into the context of an evolutionary world, the positive aspect of redemption stands out more saliently. Creation and redemption are bound together in a world which is in the process of becoming, a world in which the redemptive activity of Christ is to unify all things in Himself. Through the 'genèse' of Teilhard's system, creation and redemption are seen as complementary aspects of a single process which process leads to the unification of all things in Christ in the fulness of the Pleroma.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Christianisme et Évolution," ibid., p. 213.

[2] Teilhard, "Réflexions sur le Péché originel, ibid., p. 230.

XUM

(3) Relation to Incarnation

Teilhard, sympathetic to the Scotist position, believed that to create is to unite and this implies some degree of involvement in the world. In his system of convergent evolution creating means uniting and this demands self-immersion. Jesus, by his Incarnation has become internally and intimately connected with all of creation. His relationship to the world is not extrinsic or moral or juridical but intrinsic and organic. Teilhard laments the fact that in spite of Paul's teaching and the theologizing of the Greek Fathers "Christ's universal power over Creation has hitherto been considered by theologians primarily in an extrinsic and juridical aspect."[1] Teilhard further explains that Christ is not king because his father has declared him to be king, but because He is the universal center in the organic and evolving universe.

> And since he, Christ, is the organic principle of this harmonising process, the whole universe is *ipso facto* stamped with his character, shaped according to his direction, and animated by his form.[2]

If the Incarnation, however, is set within a framework of cosmogenesis and forms one aspect of a process, it cannot be considered as an end in itself. It looks to the Pleroma. The primary motive of creation, then, must be the redemptive work of Christ, as Creation,

---

[1] Teilhard, "Super-Humanity, Super-Christ, Super-Charity," in *Science and Christ*, p. 165.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

Incarnation, and Redemption are seen as one process. The Incarnation sheds light on the motive of creation as it looks towards the future and the Pleroma. It is revelation that attests to the salvific work of Christ through the Incarnation. As Mooney says, then, "Christ must therefore be the goal of creation insofar as he is its Saviour."[1] In Teilhard's vision

> the fundamental cosmic process of cephalisation culminates and is completed, on a scale that is universal and with a depth that is supernatural, and yet in harmony with the whole of the past.[2]

Christ is the head of creation which is continuing. Redemption, which gives meaning to human history, lies not merely in the past but in the future. Christ, through His Passion and Death carries the weight of the world's progress toward the Pleroma. Redemption is expiation, but also unification and progress. It is creation and building. For Teilhard, man can participate in redemption by building and transforming the world and completing the creation begun by God. The impulse towards progress and towards the fullest development of Mankind will find its completion in the maturation of mankind. Creation through the Incarnation and Redemption will be brought to fulfillment in Pleromization.

---

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and The Mystery of Christ, p. 121.

[2] Teilhard, "Super-Humanity, Super-Christ, Super-Charity," in Science and Christ, p. 167.

(4) Relation to Cross

It was Teilhard's conviction that historically the Cross has been presented as a symbol of sadness and repression. He rejected any way of preaching the Passion and Death of Jesus which fostered the impression that "the Kingdom of God can only be established in mourning and by thwarting and going against the current of man's aspirations and energies."[1] He believed that the Cross imposes a particular direction to which men adhere, that is, those men who believe that life is on a road which leads somewhere. He says

> ...Jesus on the Cross is both the symbol and the reality of the immense labour of the centuries which has, little by little, raised up the created spirit and brought it back to the depths of the divine contact.[2]

For Teilhard "the Cross was placed on the crest of the road which leads to the highest peaks of creation,"[3] and the Christian is asked not "to swoon in the shadow, but to climb in the light of the Cross."[4]

The Cross as a symbol of true progress is found consistently throughout the writings of Teilhard. It symbolizes not only the redemptive work of Christ, but also the work of the Christian who is laboring to build the earth. It expresses "the symbol of progress and victory through mistakes, disappointments and hard work...."[1] The redemption which was won on the Cross and is symbolized by it, in the thought of Teilhard, pertains not only to reparation, but more especially and primarily to creation. It is this theory of redemption as creation which will give direction to the thought of Teilhard as he establishes the place of the Christian activity in the world and as he theologizes about the Second Coming of Christ. The earth is yet unfinished and is to be completed and "The Cross is now not only the symbol of expiation, but the token, too, of growth through suffering."[2] It is "the symbol and significant act of Christ raising up the world with all its burden of inertia...."[3] Teilhard believed that Christianity is pledged to the cross and dominated by it. He states that "Christianity cannot remain itself except by always identifying itself more intensely with the essence of the Cross."[4] For Teilhard the Cross he accepted is "exactly the same Cross...

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 77.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] *Loc. cit.*

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction à la Vie chrétienne," in Comment Je Crois, p. 192.

[2] Teilhard, "Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 123.

[3] Teilhard, "Quelques Vues générales sur l'Essence du Christianisme," in Comment Je Crois, pp. 156-157.

[4] Teilhard, "Ce que le Monde attend de l'Église de Dieu," ibid., p. 257.

but much more true."[1] It is a Cross "in which are synthesized the two components of the future, the transcendent and the ultra-human, or,...the Above and the Ahead."[2] He wanted the Cross to be rooted in the past but also to expand to the dimension of a new age. As he said

> Progress-creation, transgression-fall, suffering-Redemption...the three must be taken together as one in order to understand adequately the meaning of the Cross.[3]

Teilhard wanted to transform the meaning of cross without distorting its traditional redemptive meaning. He wanted the Cross, in saving human nature and redeeming all creation to be a sign of progress. He saw, not a purely redemptive cross in traditional terms, but a redemptive cross transposed into the terms of a world still being created.

iii. Original Sin

Teilhard had no doubts about the reality of original sin, but he wanted to re-think it, expand its dimensions and locate it beyond man and the personal in all of the created universe. In an unpublished paper written in 1922 Teilhard offered some criticism of the traditional understanding of original sin and presented some directions theologians could explore to present original sin in a manner reconcilable with an evolutionary world view. He believed that science had seriously called into question both the concept of monogenism as traditionally understood and the existence of an earthly paradise. As he wrote "The more we bring the past to life again by means of science, the less we can find a place for either Adam or the earthly paradise."[1] Yet it was his opinion that in studying the past one discovers a world "dominated by physical evil, impregnated with moral evil,...a world *in a state of original sin*."[2] His tentative explanation of original sin was that

---

[1] Ibid., p. 260.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Teilhard, "Chute, Rédemption et Géocentrie," ibid., p. 54. Note Two.

> original sin expresses, translates, personifies, in an instantaneous, localized act, the perennial and universal law of imperfection which is in mankind *in virtue* of its being 'in fieri'.[3]

For Teilhard, all creation "inevitably has its counterpart in some redemption."[4] By regarding the principal transgression as the "moral crisis which apparently accompanied the first appearance of intelligence in man"[5] Teilhard would establish a continuity among Creation, Fall, Incarnation and Redemption so that they would be seen as "aspects (distinct in reality but physically linked)of one and the same divine operation"[1] and would posit an original sin as vast as the world, a cosmic fault that would be in accord with a revealed cosmic redemption. Christ would be savior of the entire world, and its center.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Note sur quelques Représentations historiques possibles du Péché originel, *Ibid*., p. 62.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 63.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 67-8.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 68.

[5] *Loc*. *cit*.

Some two years before this essay Teilhard wrote that in treating the biblical account of human origins and the evidence of modern scientific discovery "the principal obstacle...is the traditional notion of original sin."[2] Before Galileo the historical representation of the Fall and the dogmatic teaching of universal redemption were easily compatible, but the horizons opened up after Galileo presented the dilemma either of re-thinking the dimensions of original sin or severely restricting the Fall and Redemption to a fragment of the universe. It was his opinion that "the Church cannot measure up to the truth except by universalizing the first and the second Adam."[3] This certainly calls in question the individuality of the first Adam.

It was this attempt to re-think and to re-cast original sin that initiated the first crisis in Teilhard's career. He was requested by his superiors not to say or write anything contrary to the Church's traditional teaching on original sin and he was sent to a post in China effectively excluding him from the academic circles of Paris.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 69.

[2] Teilhard, "Chute, Rédemption et Géocentrie," ibid., p. 49.

[3] Ibid., p. 52.

In 1947, Teilhard put forth his reflections on original sin offering them especially "for the criticism of the theologians."[1] His primary concern in treating original sin was to keep safe the Christian understanding that Jesus Christ is Lord of the universe. It was his view that "However vast the world is discovered to be, the figure of the risen Jesus must embrace the world.[2] If original sin is regarded as an isolated act and not as a state then this could compromise the concept of universal redemption which he saw as necessary if Christ is to be maintained as the head of creation. In an earlier essay Teilhard affirmed the strict sense of original sin attributing moral evil to human responsibility.

> I have no difficulty in accepting that the evil inherent in the world as a result of its method of creation can be regarded as becoming particularly individualized on earth at the moment of the appearance of responsible human 'I's.[3]

Yet he wished to stress the origins of physical and moral evil in the very structure of participating being. He saw a universal redemption correcting the evil linked to the most basic structure in the creative process since he saw original sin as "a combined effect of atomicity (statistical disorder) and organicity (general contamination of the human mass).[1] He sees this cosmic view as reflecting a modern view of the universe in the process of becoming. He sees its value in the fact that it is able "to substitute a collective 'matrix' and a collective heredity for the womb of our mother Eve"[2] and frees one from the monogenist position.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Réflexions sur le Péché originel," ibid., p. 217.

[2] Ibid., p. 222.

[3] Teilhard, "Quelques Vues générales sur l'Essence du Christianisme, ibid., p. 157.

Teilhard, then, situates original sin in all of creation. God's creative act and the process of creation can be understood as a gradual process of unification and of arrangement. To create is to unite. In a universe which is converging evil, from his standpoint, is a necessity, and original sin is a structural element which is inevitable in the universe. It is a state of mankind and of the whole world. Every person, by his solidarity with all mankind, is subject to original sin. Original sin is not simply an event in an historical link of events. It is a mode of evolution and if creation is progressive unification then original sin is equated with the negative forces which tend to disperse. It is the law of the universe.

It is possible within the limits of Teilhard's hypotheses to regard the individualization of evil in the world when the first men appeared. Acceptance of his theory would free one from the obligation of seeing the entire human race deriving from one couple. To Teilhard, Adam was a symbol of all men born in a fallen state. Men are born in original sin because this state is the law of the universe, a general condition enveloping all mankind.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Réflexions sur le Peché originel," ibid., p. 229, Footnote Two.

[2] Loc. cit.

iv. Freedom and Evil

In regard to man and the future of man Teilhard was decidedly an optimist, but he was optimistic with the clear recognition that man was free to choose. He was not an evolutionary determinist and was very much aware of man's sinfulness and perversity and the challenge to man's progress. Although his cosmic viewpoint led him to examine things more in their evolutionary and collective phases, than in their individual aspects, and he did not believe it likely that the universal impulse leading to the rise of consciousness over millions of years would fail, nonetheless in regard to human freedom he states "up to a point we are free as individuals to resist the trends and demands of Life."[1] Teilhard believed that in each of us by our very nature "everything is in an elemental state, including our freedom of action."[2] The maturation

---

[1] Teilhard, "Faith in Peace," in The Future of Man, p. 152.

[2] Teilhard, "The Formation of the Noosphere," ibid., p. 182.

XUM

and growth of freedom can be fostered only by socialization when individuals join and associate with each other. For him "A simple freedom, taken in isolation, is weak and uncertain and may easily lose itself in mere groping."[1] But he calls this process of socialization a "dangerous operation"[2] recognizing the inherent forces that can cause disorder or lead to a stifling of the very freedom sought.

Freedom should increase through socialization since true union does not suppress differences but reveals them more strongly, and if the union is of persons then this differentiation realizes itself in a further personalization. Teilhard realizes that man can and must grow in freedom with other men. He realizes also the element of chance in nature, so for the Christian, relying not on phenomenology but on revelation, "the final success is guaranteed by the 'redeeming virtue' of the God incarnate in his creation."[3]

For Teilhard the evolutionary process continues in man toward an increasing freedom. The true evolution of the world is taking place in the human consciousness, and in the conscious union of man with man. In the thought of Teilhard it is the will of God, expressed in evolution, that men mature into free and responsible co-workers in his creation. So man is fashioned to grow in freedom and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 183.

[2] Ibid., p. 182.

[3] Ibid., p. 307. Footnote One.

Teilhard notes that the creature must work, if he wishes to be further created. Man must choose freely to cooperate in God's work of creation. For Teilhard the redemptive work of Christ is not simply objective or automatic. Salvation is the union of all the faithful with Christ at the Pleroma. But man is free to accept or reject God's gifts. Teilhard insists that each man must choose and the choice is profound and decisive. Man's freedom arises from his unique ability to be able to view himself from within. This self-reflexive process enables him to see himself as a subject. He is able to affirm himself as a creative center. Man acquires a distinct personality which makes him distinguishable from all others and which allows him to be responsible for his destiny through the choice which he is able to exercise. It is this ability of man to choose and to be responsible which allows for the presence of sin in the world.

For Teilhard creation is unification and the process is an evolutionary unification. By organizing and unifying under his attracting influence, God creates continuously. Since all order in its formation implies disorder, then Teilhard sees evil synonymous with disorder and something that cannot be absent from evolutionary creation. Evil in general is a necessary by-product of the quest for unity and since creation is not immediate, evil is physically necessary.

XUM

In transposing a concept of evil from a world which was fixed and static into a world of movement and becoming, he delineates a threefold conception of evil: the evil of disorder and failure arising from a material derangement, the evil of decomposition and death, and the evil, particular to man, of solitude and anxiety originating in man's reflection on the vastness of the universe and his limited understanding of it. And there is also the evil of growth, which progress toward increased unity through work and effort.[1] He is at pains to express clearly that his purpose "has been limited to bringing out the positive essence of the biological process of hominisation,"[2] and he was not concerned "to provide the negative of the photograph."[3] Yet he sees that evil, in his system, "inevitably seeps out through every nook and cranny, through every joint and sinew...."[4]

In dealing with moral evil Teilhard recognizes that man can choose and so sin is possible. Man can decide by turning in upon himself and by separating himself from other men. Teilhard saw moral evil as a refusal to love or a refusal to unite in love with others. Through the unity created by love man becomes less of an individual and more of a person. But man has the option to refuse to love and therefore to suffer the effects of this moral evil. Man can increase the disorder in creation.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 310.

[2] Ibid., p. 309.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] Loc. cit.

The good for Teilhard is a total eschatological reality. He views the Christian task as combatting evil by the totality of the efforts of man to shape and subdue the forces of nature and to bring them into subjection. His conception of moral evil involves man's refusal to accept his responsibility. To Teilhard it is clear that the evil in the world attests to the fact that man has often refused and still refuses. In regard to the quantity and quality of the evil found in the world today and its basis in original sin, he does not feel as a scientist that he is in a position to pronounce on it. And although he wishes to remain in the scientific realm when speaking of evil and evolution, still he says that

> In one manner or the other it still remains true that, even in the view of the mere biologist, the human epic resembles nothing so much as a way of the Cross.[1]

As with his other concerns, Teilhard's treatment of sin is in the context of cosmic evolution in which light he sees sin as the evil that is proper to reflexive consciousness. He says "there is only one evil--disunity. We call it 'moral' when it affects the free zones of the soul."[2]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 80. Footnote Fifteen.

XUM

He summarizes his view of evil succinctly as

> Physical disharmony or decomposition among the pre-living, suffering among the living, sin in the domain of freedom: there is no order in the process of being formed that does not at every stage imply disorder.[1]

So what on the lower level is simply evil, on the level of humanization becomes moral evil. For Teilhard, man's freedom is the result of evolution. Man can now use his freedom to further his evolution or retard it. The success of the human species is influenced by "chance at the bottom and freedom at the top."[2] In spite of the freedom which allows man to sin and jeopardizes the human race, Teilhard is optimistic about man's future, but it is his faith that supports his optimism. For he says that the Incarnation guarantees the success of mankind "But this takes us beyond the place of phenomenology."[3]

v. Grace

It was Teilhard's contention that there can be no natural end for the evolutionary process. He believed that whatever God has created has been destined to establish a unity in which Jesus Christ is the center. For him the emphasis is on the divine initiative which comes from God at His own time. Teilhard saw an evolving universe tending towards Christ as its immanent end. Since a natural process attains its natural end through its own powers, then to explain how the term of the evolutionary process can attain to Christ-Omega is to call into question the gratuitousness of the supernatural. This was a dilemma that Teilhard faced early in his writings on the relationship between evolution and Christ and it was his great concern not to diminish the concept of God's gift of grace.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Comment Je Vois," (1948, unpublished essay, Library of the American Teilhard de Chardin Society, New York City).

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 307.

[3] Loc. cit.

(1) Body of Christ

In the preface to The Divine Milieu, Teilhard's most complete spiritual work, he warns the reader not to be concerned that he did not explain more thoroughly the action of grace, because he was dealing with man as in the realm of conscious psychology. But he is quick to add that "the notion of grace impregnates the whole atmosphere of my book"[1] not only as a theoretical entity "but also in the sense of a living reality."[2] Teilhard did not feel the need in this work to make an explicit distinction between what is divine influence and human work because he took the existence of both for granted. But he was quite aware of man's need of grace for he says in the first note of the opening chapter that "the least admixture of what

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 12.

[2] Loc. cit.

XUM

may be called Pelagianism would suffice to ruin immediately the beauties of the divine milieu in the eyes of the 'seer'."[1]

DeLubac points out in a careful analysis of Teilhard's conception of nature and grace that in every period there emerges a consistency of view in regard to the natural and the supernatural, a consistency which emphasizes both the coherence between them and their analogical relationship. DeLubac states "the result of man's effort can never by itself have any positively supernatural value. This is a point on which Pere Teilhard is perfectly clear."[2] Teilhard himself attested to this in a letter written in 1950 when he said:

> My views, as you know, hardly change, but they simplify themselves and interlock with such an increase of intensity--in the interplay (as wonderfully contrived) of what I call the two lines of curvature (or convergence)--the cosmic ('natural') and the Christic ('super-natural').[3]

For Teilhard a static, immobile universe, a pre-evolutionary universe lacked the dynamism inherent in a universe in process. It lacked an understanding of the physical interdependence of all elements in the cosmos. He was always the evolutionist and such an interdependence was always at the forefront of his thinking and reflection.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17. Footnote One.

[2] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 141.

[3] Teilhard, Letters From a Traveller, p. 303.

XUM

It was the concept of the organic Body of Christ and its physical influence that provided what Mooney calls the "Master Key to the many-chambered edifice of Teilhard's Christology."[1] The task, for Teilhard, is to penetrate the real ontological unity of the universe. It is to reveal the influence of Christ in the very core of reality and to assure that no part of creation is free from this influence. In speaking of this primacy of Christ, Teilhard says:

> because of the genetic links running through all levels of Time and Space between the elements of a convergent world, the Christ-influence, far from being restricted to the mysterious zones of 'grace,' spreads and penetrates throughout the entire mass of Nature in movement. In such a world Christ cannot sanctify the Spirit without (as the Greek Fathers intuitively perceived) uplifting and saving the totality of Matter.[2]

It was this energy of Christ that gives the world its definitive intelligibility. For Teilhard "the universe is physically impregnated to the very core of its matter..."[3] by the Incarnate Word, and "the vital, organising influence of the universe,..., is essentially grace."[4] But he wants to intensify and broaden the notion of grace to make it

---

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 100.

[2] Teilhard, "The New Spirit, 1942," in The Future of Man, p. 94.

[3] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 57.

[4] Loc. cit.

XUM

consonant with the evolving and expanding notion of the universe. He points out that theologians include grace in the category of 'accident' and says of these theologians "Enslaved to their philosophical categories they make it... into something infrasubstantial."[1] For Teilhard "grace is no less intimate to ourselves, no less substantial, than humanity."[2] Because Christ is the center of the universe "he does not restrict his organising activity simply to one zone of our being--that of sacramental relationships and the 'habitus' of virtues"[3] but his influence permeates the entire range of human activities and material determinism. All these are "steeped in final purpose"[4] and all nature is graced.

Teilhard is careful to remove the danger of false pantheism by placing the Christ-Omega at the upper terminus of a conscious spiritualization. Christ is bound to the universe, not extrinsically or juridically, but structurally and organically. It is in Christ that the world seeks and finds its final unity and coherence. It is grace which allows man to recognize the source of all grace, for

> It is under the illuminative influence of grace that our mind recognizes, in the unitive character of the Christian phenomenon, a manifestation

---

[1] Ibid., p. 58.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] Loc. cit.

> (reflection) of Omega or human consciousness, and it identifies the Omega of reason with the universal Christ of revelation.[1]

(2) Gratuity

Teilhard says very little of the nature of grace. He assumes it is everywhere as the influence of Christ is universal. The initiative of grace is God's. The response is man's. As he says, "From you, every initiative, beginning with that of my prayer,"[2] and faith through grace is the ability to see this connection. There is no opposition between the grace of God and the freedom of man for man's freedom is itself the product of God's work in the evolutionary process. Freedom, as an aspect of the power of the spirit to reflect on itself and grow in love, grows along with the spirit. Man is called to turn from himself to the totality and thereby to Christ as the term of mankind. Man can make no such choice unless God reveals himself in Christ. Man is free to reject the grace of God and to reject grace is a failure on man's part to exercise his true freedom.

Teilhard saw grace at work on different levels, penetrating all reality. When man encounters the Gospel of Jesus Christ and through the grace of God puts on faith in Jesus, he is led into the community of believers in which

---

[1] Teilhard, La Pensée du Père Teilhard de Chardin," in Les etudes philosophiques, X (1955), 581.

[2] Teilhard, Hymn of the Universe, p. 21.

XUM

grace works on the level of consciousness. Salvation is obtained through a free response to the grace of Christ. It is God's grace that saves in a world of evolutionary process.

(3) Hope

Teilhard's evolutionary system gave him an orientation to the future, and when he contemplated the future it appeared to him to be full of excitement. It is hope for the future, according to Teilhard, that enables man to work in the present. Without hope of a successful outcome of humanity and without assurance that one's labors would be fruitful Teilhard felt that man would lose his zest for living. He was confident that evolutionary progress would not be halted, stressing that man "can hope for no progress on earth without the primacy and triumph of the *personal* at the summit of *mind*."[1] It was the uniqueness of man as a thinking being that undergirded Teilhard's optimism for "since the birth of thought man has been the leading shoot of the tree of life."[2] It was also the Christian faith, grounded in revelation, that supported Teilhard in his optimism about the future and the hope of man. Christianity, for him, is "the *unique* current of thought" daring and progressive enough to spur

---

[1] Teilhard, *The Phenomenon of Man*, p. 297.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 276.

XUM

man on to build the earth and to give him the needed assurance of a successful outcome. As de Lubac says "the optimism that Pere Teilhard professed and constantly retained in spite of everything represented in him the victory of faith."[1]

The Vision.--For Teilhard hope is "the essential impulse, without which nothing can be done."[2] If faith in God and faith in the world are to flourish then direction must attend their advance. This direction, he believes, is one which leads to greater synthesis and unity through increasing organization. It is a direction stressing the corporate over the individual. He says "Our hope can only be realized if it finds its expression in greater cohesion and greater human solidarity."[3] The entire process of creation and life is one of unification, and on the human plane, personalization. It is corporate effort that develops persons and leads to progress. The Christian vision must integrate this human hope with that hope given by faith in Christ. He saw no competition between God and man but saw rather that "the greater man becomes, the more humanity becomes united, with consciousness of, and

---

[1] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 43.

[2] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on Progress," in The Future of Man, p. 72.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

mastery of, its potentialities...."[1] So "we must try everything for Christ; we must hope everything for Christ."[2] It is a hope, based on convergent evolution and Christian faith, which continues to grow in its search for more being as well as for increased well-being. As Teilhard says, "We shall never put enough hope in the growing unity of mankind."[3]

Teilhard believed that the strong resistance of the world to good has engendered a pessimism on the part of many Christians, fostered by a stringent view of original sin and an overemphasis on the corruption and wickedness of the world. He sees this view as antithetical to the true Christian outlook, as he says "Successors to Israel, we Christians have been charged with keeping the flame of desire ever alive in the world."[4] It was the challenge of the Marxists and secular humanists giving hope to modern society that led him to concentrate on this aspect of Christian hope and to ask, "Where is the Catholic as passionately vowed (by conviction and not by convention) to spreading the hopes of the Incarnation as are many humanitarians to spreading the dream of the new city?"[5]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 137.

[2] Ibid., p. 138.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] Ibid., p. 135.

[5] Loc. cit.

(4) The Direction

Teilhard believed that the flame must be rekindled and desire and hope for the second coming of Christ must once again dominate Christian thinking. Rejuvenation of hope would come "From the perception of a more intimate connection between the victory of Christ and the outcome of the work which our human effort here below is seeking to construct."[1] The victory of Christ is his victory on the Cross. It is, above all, in the symbol of the Cross that hope is to be found. But where the primary emphasis traditionally has fallen upon the concept of expiation, Teilhard wishes to emphasize the Cross as creative. It is "an act of expiation but one also of breakthrough and conquest."[2] Christians must develop "a gospel of human conquest."[3] Christianity cannot maintain its self-identity "except by identifying itself ever more intensely with the essence of the Cross,"[4] but for Teilhard the stress must be shifted from expiation to creation. It is this shift that will balance the upward and the forward and restore hope to man. Teilhard says

---

[1] Ibid., p. 136.

[2] Teilhard, "Some General Views on the Essence of Christianity," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 135.

[3] Teilhard, "Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 122.

[4] Teilhard, "What the World is Looking For From the Church," ibid., p. 216.

> at present our magnificent Christian charity lacks what it needs to make it decisively effective, the sensitizing ingredient of Human faith and hope without which, in reason and in fact, no religion can henceforth appear to Man other than colourless, cold and inassimable.[1]

Hope, then, is the combination of faith in man and human progress, and faith in God who has revealed himself in Jesus. The future is a point where the work of man and the work of Christ converge. The secret of understanding the world is to be found in its summit and not in its origin. Teilhard was concerned with the unity between faith in God and faith in man. Man must desire a passionate taste for the world which is God's handiwork and share the task of creation.

2. Faith and Order

Resurrection and Redemption

When the delegates of the many Christian churches represented at Lausanne in 1927 presented their reports to the Conference for transmission to the churches, they noted that the reports were "neither exhaustive nor in all details satisfactory to every member of the Conference,..."[2] and, rejoicing over the agreements reached, determined to continue to build on those agreements. One

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," in The Future of Man, pp. 265-266.

[2] "Preamble," Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 460.

XUM

agreement without which the entire Assembly would have been unthinkable, was that of "Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord."[1] The message of the Church, to be proclaimed to the whole world, is the Gospel, and Jesus is the Center, "He Himself is the Gospel,"[2] which is "the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth..."[3] It is the living Christ who calls men to salvation through His Church. The foundation of Christian belief is the resurrection of Jesus, and it is the sine qua non of the Faith and Order Movement. It is also the fundamental basis of Teilhard's vision of unity.

While the delegates at Lausanne proclaimed that Jesus is Lord, and He Himself is the message to be proclaimed, they also affirmed that, "The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter,"[4] a statement whose implications are very much under consideration at the present time by the Faith and Order Commission as it continues to come to grips with the meaning and dimensions of redemption. Edinburgh spoke of the manifestation of grace in creation and life, "but above all in our redemption through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ,"[1] as well as in the gift of the Spirit, the Church, the Word and Sacraments, giving emphasis to the presence of the Lord in the Church. The delegates acknowledged that God's will established the Church on earth through Jesus, "particularly through the fact of His resurrection, of the gathering of His disciples round their crucified, risen and victorious Lord,..."[2] and it is the Church where "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is to be realized in the children of His adoption."[3] It is "the Church, walking by faith in its risen Lord,"[4] which interprets the scriptures and expresses God's word to every age. Although the Gospels indicated that the central message of Jesus was concerned with the Kingdom of God and not with the Church, "No one can doubt, however, that the resurrection of Jesus was central for the Church of the New Testament."[5]

---

[1] "The Church's Message to the World - the Gospel," Report of Section Two, ibid., p. 462.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 463.

[4] Ibid., p. 461.

The Amsterdam Assembly, meeting after the disasters

---

[1] "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ," Chapter Two, The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 224.

[2] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," Chapter Three, ibid., p. 230.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] "The Church of Christ: Ministry and Sacraments," Chapter Five, ibid., p. 239.

[5] Clarence T. Craig, "The Church of the New Testament," in Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 34.

XUM

of World War II and their attendant evils, could not help but be conscious of the corruption of institutions and human communities, as well as individuals, and so turned their attention to the "cosmic dimensions of evil,"[1] which demanded an unceasing proclamation of the universal Lordship of Christ. They saw the need to come to a deeper understanding of "the relation, in the saving acts of God in Christ, between objective redemption and personal salvation..."[2] and "the nature of the churches' responsibility for the common life of men and their temporal institutions."[3] The focus of the Amsterdam Assembly still reflected the stress on the Church's role in redemption, "God's redeeming activity in the world has been carried out through His calling a People to be His own chosen People,"[4] but increasing attention had to be given to the relationship between Church and World.

Lund sounded a strong eschatological note in speaking of Christ and the Church when it said, "At the end of its pilgrimage Jesus Christ, the Crucified and Risen, will come again to meet His Church in order to complete

---

[1] "The Lordship of Christ," The Ecumenical Review, vol. XI, (July, 1959), p. 440.

[2] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 206.

[3] Ibid., p. 207.

[4] Ibid., p. 204.

XUM

His work of redemption and judgment,"[1] so the Church must be "patiently watching for the final consummation of its redemption."[2] At the same time, the Church is a "partaker in the risen Body of the same Lord,"[3] who "has entered into oneness with man in his estrangement and in his existence..."[4] The new age of the future is already a reality and the Church, united with the risen Christ participates in this new age. The Church, united with the risen Christ participates in this new age. The Church belongs to the new creation. Amsterdam recognized the need for a fuller understanding of the relationship of the visible Church to the new creation in Christ.[5] This tension between the already and the not yet called for continuing examination of the concept of redemption.

Meeting just two years after Lund, the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches based its unshakeable hope on the resurrection of Jesus and His Second Coming. Promising to "Speak together of the living Christ, the hope of the world. The joyous word rings across the world and through all time: 'Christ is risen.' We cry: 'Christ is risen indeed.'"[1] And looking to the future the Assembly said, "His eternal purpose of redemption will be brought to its complete consummation."[2] Yet there were significant disagreements about the Report, reflecting the growing awareness of problems created by the resurgence of non-Christian religions and the redemptive work of Christ outside the Church. The delegates found that the Report on the Main Theme lacked "adequate treatment of the theme of creation and cosmic redemption."[3] The Report on Evangelism took note of the revival and renewal of non-Christian religions, which is often accompanied by social reform, and whose appeal to many is "the present determination to interpret and change oppressive conditions of life."[4] There was need for the Church to relate the Word to the aspirations of man. Words must be embodied in works of service and compassion. Evanston remarked that, "those outside the Church make little distinction between faith and works,"[5] a view certainly shared by Teilhard.

---

[1] "Christ and His Church - The Report," The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 20.

[2] Ibid., pp. 19-20.

[3] Ibid., p. 18.

[4] Ibid., p. 17.

[5] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 206.

---

[1] "The Statement on the Report of the Advisory Committee on the Main Theme," The Evanston Report, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), p. 71.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 70.

[4] "Evangelism: the Mission of the Church to Those Outside Her Life," Report of Section Two, ibid., p. 106.

[5] Ibid., p. 102.

XUM

Yet the response to Evanston established once again the need for a clearer understanding of the nature of redemption. The concerns of evangelism were seen to be first of all, "so to proclaim the gospel that it will transform the groupings and patterns of society...to bring people into the full life of the Church as expressed in a local congregation...and the bringing of persons to Christ as Saviour and Lord."[1] This Report was criticized by some as confusing the aims of evangelism with the results. The last aim is the only one. The others are results. The Report is "open to the danger that the proclamation of the gospel may become a mere activity directed toward a social end.[2] In 1955 the Division of Studies was commissioned by the Central Committee of the World Council to begin a study on the Lordship of Christ over the Church and the world which would deal with this problem of the relationship between the Church and the World.

i. Cosmic Redemption

New Delhi reflected the increased emphasis on cosmic redemption and the fact that the "New Testament affirms the completeness of Christ's victory and claims that salvation wrought by Christ embraces the whole universe

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 101.

[2] World Council of Churches, _Response to Evanston_ (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1957), p. 21.

XUM

including the cosmic powers themselves."[1] The Section on Witness stated that, "Christ embraces all creation and the whole of mankind,"[2] and, "The mighty acts of his ministry, death and resurrection and ascension were the out-working of a single purpose, the redemption of the world."[3] Professor Schlink remarked that, "it was not yet possible to reach a common statement about God's work amongst men outside the Proclamation of the Gospel,"[4] but the delegates nevertheless affirmed that God is not without witnesses, even among men where Christ is not known, and affirmed, also, "that the reconciliation wrought through Christ embraces all creation and the whole of mankind."[5]

In the Section on Service the delegates recognized that Christians and non-Christians alike are confused by the relationships between nature, man and God and expressed the belief that, "there is urgent need for the development of a theology of nature,"[6] although some questioned whether such a thing was possible.[1]

---

[1] "The Lordship of Christ," The Ecumenical Review, p. 441.

[2] "Witness," Reports of the Sections, The New Delhi Report, p. 81.

[3] Ibid., p. 79.

[4] "Discussion of the Report of the Section on Witness," ibid., p. 92.

[5] "Witness," Reports of the Sections, ibid., p. 81.

[6] "Service," Reports of the Sections, ibid., p. 96.

ii. Creation and Redemption

At Montreal the delegates were agreed that, "the grace and power of God is to be found in and received from the world of man outside the Church and in non-human creation,"[2] corresponding to Teilhard's view that grace permeates all of nature.[3] There was no agreement, however, as to whether these are redemptive works of God, or if they could be viewed as works of Jesus Christ or as signs of his Lordship. It was not surprising, therefore, to receive a recommendation from Montreal that, "The whole question of the proper relation of creation and redemption needs much further study in Faith and Order."[4] After extensive debate there was no clear-cut resolution as to how to describe Christ's Lordship over the world, and whether it is exercised apart from the community of the faithful.

The Faith and Order Commission meeting at Aarhus the following year noted that, "in the thinking and discourse of Christians, and especially in biblical exegesis, a renewed concern with God's action in creation has made its appearance at many points,"[1] and proposed a study that eventuated in the document "God in Nature and History," published in New Directions in Faith and Order.[2]

---

[1] "Discussion of the Report of the Section on Service," ibid., p. 114.

[2] "The Church in the Purpose of God," Report of Section One, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 43.

[3] Teilhard, "The New Spirit, 1942," in The Future of Man, p. 94.

[4] Loc. cit.

This document, whose starting point was salvation history, nevertheless recognizes that the theory of evolution permeates the thought of the present age and "The Christian Church shares in the bewilderment created by this new experience and understanding."[3] The question arises as to whether God is related to this world view, or whether He can speak to the optimism or pessimism it engenders. And the document declares that, "The crucial miracle on which the Christian's hope for the world and himself depends, is Christ's resurrection."[4] The resurrection is, "the first-fruits of the consummation," the "dawn of God's new order," a new order which "includes our total existence, both body and soul." It is a "sign disclosing the future order toward which we are underway."[5] The Resurrection is a matter of faith and not capable of

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," in Minutes of the Meetings, Aarhus, p. 44.

[2] See Page.

[3] "God in Nature and History," New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 8.

[4] Ibid., p. 22

[5] Loc. cit.

XUM

scientific proof, but it can offer a new perspective to scientists and may help him discover models or analogies which can assist him to examine his faith with his scientific pattern of thought. Christ must be confessed as "the ultimate secret of creation," for "the crucified and risen Jesus of Nazareth is the key to the understanding of the whole created world."[1]

In his remarks in discussing the paper, Principal Marsh said that "The event of creation can therefore not be separated from the event of redemption: both are seen complete in Jesus Christ."[2] And the document states succinctly that, "It is important to see how the framework of the unity of creation, nature history and consummation is maintained, and how at the same time this whole concept is deepened and elaborated through the experience of God's incomparable action in history in Jesus Christ."[3] This must lead to a renewal of the concept of the consummation, for according to the document, "the consummation could be nothing other than the glorious revelation of this Jesus, a world-wide resurrection, the judgment of all men...and the ordering and renewal of the world according to his new

---

[1] Ibid., p. 12.

[2] "Discussion of the Paper, 'God in Nature and History,'" ibid., p. 88.

[3] "God in Nature and History," ibid., p. 11.

XUM

humanity."[1] Consummation, then, is a higher work than creation. The future appears as the complete manifestation of God's victorious work in the process of history, and the risen Christ is the new man who leads this process to its ultimate goal.

There has been a steady development, then, in Faith and Order thinking about the Resurrection and the meaning of Redemption. Christ has come not only to rescue individuals from sin and death, but "to complete creation and to rescue the world from its incompleteness and estrangement,"[2] and to disclose "the ultimate meaning of the whole indivisible process of creation, nature and history."[3] Emphasis is given to cosmic redemption, and the risen Christ is seen as the Agent who is active now in the world leading history to its ultimate resolution. The Resurrection is viewed more as dynamic and creative, renewing and moving an evolving world to its term, and less as merely a doctrine to be believed or a proof of the validity of the Christian faith.

The paper, "God in Nature and History," was not without its critics, however, and a separate report was submitted by a small group of English-Scandinavian theologians[4] who felt that the starting point of such a study should not be salvation history focusing on the resurrection of Jesus, but should be natural theology or theology of the natural. They believed that the doctrine of creation should be the starting point and not Christ. They saw Christ as "the firstborn, not of the Church but of all creation."[1] The object of eschatological hope is God's victory in rescuing creation from corruption and from death. "The Church cannot expect to be fully reconciled to God as a first stage in the restoration of creation, before the world itself, as a second stage, comes to be summed up in Christ...Church unity must be a by-product of the reconciliation of the world."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] Cf., "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," in *New Directions in Faith and Order*, pp.133-140.

Criticism, too, was expressed of the evolutionary view of the world which the paper assumed and the view was expressed that, "the influence of Teilhard de Chardin was too evident in the paper..."[3]

At this Bristol meeting, the Faith and Order Commission planned to study the unity of the Church in the context of the unity of mankind and of creation. At Uppsala the Assembly Committee voiced their agreement with this

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," ibid., p. 138.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] "Discussion of the Paper, 'God in Nature and History,'" ibid., p. 90.

XUM

study procedure.[1] In addressing the Uppsala assembly on the theme of the Finality of Christ, Dr. Hendrikus Berkhof expressed the belief that the meaning of the resurrection, the birth of a new humanity and God's disclosure of the future in the resurrected Jesus, reveal to us a God of change and development: a God "who does not acquiesce in the status quo of mankind."[2] So the Resurrection may be viewed as a dynamic force vivifying and creating while at the same time uniting mankind. Still it is necessary to keep in mind that, "the concepts of human unity and Church unity under the creating and redeeming God are both matters of faith."[3]

iii. Grace and Freedom

From the very beginning of the Faith and Order Movement, there was recognition and agreement that the Church was God's instrument of reconciliation and sanctification of men through grace and that grace respected man's freedom. Lausanne proclaimed, "The Church of the Living God is constituted by His own will, not by the will or consent or beliefs of men whether as individuals or as societies, though He uses the will of men as His instrument."[1] Jesus Christ, full of grace and truth, proclaims the Kingdom of God, appeals to men through love, and summons him to a new life of faith and devotion to His service and to the service of mankind. The Gospel is by no means coercive, but respecting man's freedom to respond, it is a "prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God,"[2] promising justification and sanctification. Both the freedom of man and God's grace are assumed by the delegates. It was hardly possible that they should attempt to probe the nature of human freedom and the nature of grace, but they saw them both as indispensable elements in the Christian tradition and accorded them their fundamental place.

---

[1] "Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order," in The Uppsala Report, p. 223.

[2] Hendrikus Berkhof, "The Finality of Jesus Christ," in The Uppsala Report, Appendix IV, p. 307.

[3] J. Robert Nelson, "The Unity of the Church and the Unity of Mankind," What Unity Implies, Six Essays After Uppsala, ed. by Reinhard Groscurth, W.C.C. Studies, no. 7 (Geneva: W.C.C., 1969), p. 101.

The replies of the churches to the Conference Report revealed that more intensive study was needed on those subjects about which there were strong disagreements which prevented unity, and a theological committee was formed with the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Headlam, as chairman, to study the Doctrine of Grace.[3]

---

[1] "The Nature of the Church," Report of Section Three, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 463.

[2] "The Church's Message to the World - the Gospel," Report of Section Two, ibid., p. 462.

[3] "Introduction: Lausanne to Edinburgh, "The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 5.

(1) Edinburgh Statement

The result of this study was the remarkable consensus statement on the Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which emerged at Edinburgh, a statement which gave great hope to those seeking the unity of the Church. The delegates recognized on the basis of Scripture and Christian experience that God's sovereignty is supreme in regard to the relationship of grace and freedom. "Thus we men owe our whole salvation to His gracious will."[1] But although the initiative belongs to God, nevertheless, "it is the will of God that His grace should be actively appropriated by man's own will and that for such decision man should remain responsible."[2] The delegates recognized that freedom and grace appear to be antithetical and that various philosophical explanations have been offered, but stated quite clearly that, "such theories are not part of the Christian Faith."[3]

In spite of this perennial philosophical problem, the delegates were able to speak with one voice about the grace of God. The meaning of God's grace is first of all "God Himself as revealed in His Son Jesus Christ,"[4]

---

[1] "The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ," Chapter Two, *ibid*., p. 225.

[2] *Loc. cit*.

[3] *Loc. cit*.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 224.

XUM

and this is known only by those who profess that God is love. And grace is "manifested in our creation...but above all in our redemption,"[1] through Christ's death and resurrection and the sending of the Holy Spirit and the establishing of the Church. Grace is "appropriated by faith, which itself is the gift of God."[2] God justifies us through forgiveness of sin and sanctifies us through the Spirit giving us an increase in holiness, but, "Whatever our growth in holiness may be, our fellowship with God is always based upon God's forgiving grace."[3] The Church is both "the realization of God's gracious purpose in creation and redemption, and the continuous organ of God's grace in Christ by the Holy Spirit."[4] This grace is made known to men by the Word of God. Salvation is "the gift of God and the fruit of His grace."[5] Grace does not negate the freedom and responsibility of the individual; rather, it is only as response is made by faith to divine grace that true freedom is achieved."[6] Resistance to God's free gift of grace results not in freedom but slavery.

At Amsterdam much attention was given to the Church and its mission, building upon the agreement arrived at in Edinburgh that the Church is the instrument of God's

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 225.

[4] Ibid., p. 226.

[5] Ibid., p. 227.

[6] Loc. cit.

XUM

grace and it is God's gift to men for the world's salvation, but not going further in an examination of the nature of grace as such. There was a desire on the part of the delegates to attempt to come to a deeper understanding of the differences separating the churches and the agreement on the grace of God received little formal attention.

Lund re-iterated the agreements of Edinburgh, stating that, "God Himself creates the faith by which we respond to Him in worship,"[1] and that, "at the moment of Christ's encounter with men, they are free to respond, but...they could not have been seeking God had He not already found them."[2] God's gift to them was the faith by which they were enabled to respond. Yet in regard to some of the issues raised at Amsterdam relating to ministry, the delegates admitted that, "behind them lie fundamental problems concerning the nature of grace and the person and work of Christ,"[3] problems which "must be faced fully and frankly."[4]

As the World Council continued to confront the many theological problems facing the churches and attempted to

---

[1] "Ways of Worship," Report of Section Four, The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 264.

[2] Ibid., pp. 264-265.

[3] "Ways of Worship," Report of Section Four, in A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement, p. 109.

[4] Loc. cit.

XUM

explore the implications of Christ as the World's Hope, it was not able to explore the nature of grace fully and frankly. At Evanston the Orthodox delegates reminded the Assembly that, "The tragedy of the fallen world consists precisely in its inability to hope in Christ without the help of grace."[1] For the reality of grace is the unique source of the ability to preach Christ as the Hope of the World.

As the churches more and more attuned themselves to the problems of the world, the focus on grace became less theoretical and more practical. Montreal noted that, "Catholicity, as a gift of God's grace, calls us to a task,"[2] and this demands a witnessing to the Lordship of Christ over every aspect of human life, and especially does it demand a "compassionate identification with every man in his own particular need."[3] And the question asked there was, "Is God's reconciling grace seen in our midst breaking down every wall of separation in race, colour, caste, tribe, sex, class or nation..?"[4] reflecting the growing concern of the world's communities and the attempt of Faith and Order to address these problem areas.

---

[1] "Statement of the Eastern Orthodox Delegates Concerning the Main Theme of the Assembly," The Evanston Report, p. 330.

[2] "Scripture, Tradition and Traditions," Report of Section Two, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 59.

[3] *Loc. cit.*

[4] "'All in Each Place,' The Process of Growing Together," Report of Section Five, *ibid.*, p. 88.

(2) Renewal in Church and Society

The Uppsala Assembly addressed itself to the renewal of the churches and also to the renewal of the human community professing the belief that the renewal of one should foreshadow the renewal of the other. Edinburgh stressed the belief that grace is manifested in our creation, but above all it is revealed in our redemption and the Word of God proclaims this grace. Meeting in an atmosphere created by "new scientific discoveries, the protest of student revolts, the shock of assassinations, the clash of wars,"[1] and the ills created by the growing gap between rich and poor, exploiters and the exploited, the delegates at Uppsala were faced with the choice of giving prominence to dialogue with the world or stressing the proclamation of the Gospel. They recognized that "Dialogue and proclamation are not the same. The one complements the other in a total witness."[2]

Kenneth Slack, reporting on the Uppsala Assembly, notes that "The final report, although stressing the place of dialogue, gave more adequate emphasis to the

---

[1] "A Message from the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches," in The Uppsala Report, p. 5.

[2] "Renewal in Mission," Report of Section Two, ibid., p. 29.

XUM

gospel of forgiveness being declared to all mankind than the first draft presented to the Assembly."[1] Yet the priorities had changed as to give almost a new concept of mission. The centers of power and the social structures such as government and industry which have power over man are seen as determining the task of the churches in proclaiming the Gospel. It is here that the need of God's grace is evident. The appropriation of grace by man's free will and the individual's responsibility for this decision do not have the priority that Edinburgh assigned to them. In a time of rapid social change and upheaval in many areas, the stress for reconciliation has moved from the individual in need of redemption to a society laden with demonic forces and in need of reconciliation. All of mankind is struggling to effect a common humanity and, "the Christian Church must identify itself with the whole community in expressing its ministry of witness and service."[2] Urbanization, industrialization, communications media and all other structures which are centers of power now have priorities for mission and call for God's grace.

---

[1] Kenneth Slack, The Uppsala Report (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1968), p. 77.

[2] "Renewal in Mission," Report of Section Two, The Uppsala Report, p. 36.

XUM

3. Hope

In the final reports of the Lausanne Conference, the word hope is used just three times, and only once theologically. When the delegates state that God "has enlarged our horizons, quickened our understanding, and enlivened our hope."[1] There is no doubt that having considered those matters in which there were agreements and disagreements, the delegates saw that it was God's call that gathered them and that it would be God's guidance that moved them forward. The message of the Church to the World can only be the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and this was the conviction they reported to the churches. The Gospel was seen as "the joyful tidings of justification and sanctification...the comfort of those who suffer...the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God."[2] Clearly, for the delegates, the Gospel is the only way to salvation. It is the Gospel that generates hope. Yet while it proclaimed this message, the Conference in no way reached beyond these general assertions to a more specific understanding of just how the Gospel was to be all these things. The content of such terms as social regeneration, glorious liberty and aspirations of the

---

[1] "The Call to Unity," Report of Section One, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 460.

[2] "The Church's Message to the World - the Gospel," Report of Section Two, ibid., p. 462-463.

XUM

modern world and their connection with the Gospel was not explored. The hope was proclaimed but not analyzed.

The Edinburgh Conference scarcely treats the concept of hope except to say that the Conference desires "to declare to all men everywhere our assurance that Christ is the one hope of unity for the world,"[1] and that Jesus makes us one in spite of obvious divisions. The delegates recognized that the Gospel bore witness to both the Kingdom of God and the Church, but they had to state that they "are not yet of one mind about (a) the relationship of the Church to the Kingdom, and (b) the extent to which the Kingdom is made known here and now."[2] There were those who emphasized the relationship between the Church and the Kingdom and others who stressed the distinctions. There were some who stressed the presence of the Kingdom in the Church, and believed that the advent of the Kingdom could be seen in the Church's progress in the world and in the work accomplished by believers, and there were others who stressed the Kingdom that will come in glory, a Kingdom known by faith alone.[3]

Amsterdam, too, faced this question when it expressed the need for a deeper understanding of "the

---

[1] "The Affirmation of Union," The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 276.

[2] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," Chapter Three, ibid., p. 233.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

degree to which the Kingdom of God can be said to be already realized in the Church."[1] The Amsterdam Assembly sounded an eschatological note when it said that "the end of history will be the triumph of His Kingdom,"[2] and the delegates called on all men "to believe in Christ, to live in His love and to hope for His coming."[3] They spoke these words strongly in the aftermath of World War II, facing a world filled with great hopes and great disillusionments. The churches were growing in fellowship trying to transcend the age old barriers of race, class and nation which so recently had devastated peoples and land. Those at Amsterdam said, "Herein lies our hope and the ground of all our striving. It is required of us that we be faithful and obedient. The event is with God."[4]

i. Evanston: Theme of Hope

The theme of Christian Hope was chosen for the Second World Council of Churches meeting in Evanston at the Central Committee Meeting in Toronto in 1950. This theme was enunciated at the Evanston Assembly as Christ, the Hope of the World.[1] The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches established an Advisory Committee to prepare a report on this theme and the report was the result of the corporate work of some of the outstanding theologians of the time,[2] including men such as Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, C. H. Dodd, and Reinhold Niebuhr. It is not difficult to understand why the theme of Hope was chosen when one realizes that World War II had ended only five years before. The Cold War had replaced it; the Korean war had just begun. The Communists had established themselves as rulers in China. And over all loomed the grim specter of atomic weapons and warfare with the awesome possibility of destroying the earth. The world surely was facing a crisis of hope.

---

[1] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, p. 207.

[2] "Message," ibid., n.p.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] "The Church and the International Disorder," Report of Section Four, ibid., p. 218.

In addressing the Lund Conference on the work of Faith and Order, relating to the Assembly at Evanston in 1954, Dr. Visser't Hooft, recognizing that the theme of Christian Hope had provoked sharp and controversial reactions among many people, said in defense of this choice: But the truth of the matter is that this theme

---

[1] World Council of Churches' Central Committee, Minutes and Reports of the Third Meeting, Toronto, n.p.

[2] For a complete list of members of this advisory commission, see pp. v and vi of, "The Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme of the Second Assembly," The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954).

XUM

has chosen us."[1] In this time of fear and doubt about human existence itself, it was incumbent upon the churches to speak of hope. And speaking biblically about hope meant speaking eschatologically. This was in no way meant to avoid the problems facing the world, for as Dr. Visser't Hooft pointed out, "...speaking about hope would be meaningless if it were not done in constant reference and relevance to the present situation of the world."[2] This, too, was the unswerving view of Teilhard who twenty-five years before attempted to fashion a more binding connection between the outcome of human effort and the victory of Christ.[3]

In 1954 the Advisory Commission produced the report, "Christ - the Hope of the World," and this was presented to the assembly for its consideration. The Report evoked a mixed reception from the delegates. Some were enthusiastic about the report; others were hostile. The Statement on the Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme recognized "the sharp differences in theological viewpoint" which were expressed among the delegates, but stated the belief that although the Report "cannot be represented as the only word of the

---

[1] W. A. Visser't Hooft, "Faith and Order and the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches," in _The Third World Conference on Faith and Order_, p. 131.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 132.

[3] Teilhard, _The Divine Milieu_, p. 136.

Assembly on this subject,"[1] it was "a creative and provocative ecumenical statement of Christian hope for this day."[2] And so they forwarded it to the churches for their study and remarks.

While there were numerous critiques made against the report,[3] perhaps the most cogent of all of them was expressed in the statement on the Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme, which said, "We are not agreed on the relationship between the Christian's hope here and now, and his ultimate hope."[4] These differing conceptions were made evident in the addresses made to the assembly by Professors Edmund Schlink of Heidelberg and Robert Calhoun of Yale. Professor Schlink stated:

> If we expect Christ to insure this world so that men may continue undisturbed their pursuit of liberty, may carry on their business, and seek an improvement in their standard of living, then Christ is not the hope of the world, but rather the end of all the world's hopes, for Christ is the *end* of the world. The name of Christ is taken in vain if it is used as a slogan in this world's struggle for its own preservation.[5]

Professor Schlink spoke of a hope which is centered in Christ and strongly eschatological, "hope which is not of this world's ordering."[1] This eschatological focus, if overemphasized, could lead to an intolerable pessimism about human affairs.

---

[1] "The Statement on the Report of the Advisory Committee on the Main Theme," *The Evanston Report*, p. 70.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 72.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 70-77.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 70.

[5] Cecil Northcott, *Evanston World Assembly* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1954), p. 13.

Professor Calhoun spoke of the Gospel of hope as a word for and to this world:

> A truly historical word rooted in actual existence and demanding present day-by-day response, not a remote ideal nor a way of escape...Its characteristic hope looks for the ever clearer manifestation of God's sovereignty and the power of his promise in human history.[2]

But this ran counter to those who believed that no historical hopes can be guaranteed and only when the Kingdom of God is finally established can one speak of the fulfilment of hope.

One view, then, seems to view human effort pessimistically while the other puts undue confidence in man's efforts. Obviously, one view does not exclude the positive statements of the other, but the emphasis is real and all-important. It is here that the work of Teilhard can be especially valuable as he attempts to fashion a theology which connects planetary maturation as a necessary but insufficient condition for the coming of God's kingdom.

The view of the Orthodox delegates presented a third major view of Christian hope. Recognizing that the report "justly stresses the importance of the belief in the second coming of Christ for the Christian Hope,"[1] still the Orthodox "strongly believe that it is necessary to place an adequate emphasis on the actual presence of the Kingdom of God in the Church. The Kingdom has been founded by God through the Incarnation of His Son, the Redemption, the Resurrection, the Ascension of Christ in glory and the descent of the Holy Spirit. It has been existing on earth since Pentecost and is open to all men..."[2]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

Despite the divergences in theological perspectives about the nature of Christian hope, the message of Evanston of the cause of this hope began with the fundamental Christian assertion, "We affirm our faith in Jesus Christ as the hope of the world,"[3] and the object of such hope "Together with the whole creation we wait for this with eager hope."[4] The expectation here refers to the consummation of all things in Christ, recognizing that a new life and a new community have begun whose purpose is to make Christ known throughout the world until He comes again as Judge and Sovereign. The Report of Section Two on Evangelism puts it succinctly: "Therefore are Christians under constraint to declare this hope to the world until the consummation of the Kingdom and the coming of the King."[1]

---

[1] "A Statement of the Eastern Orthodox Delegates Concerning the Main Theme of the Assembly," The Evanston Report, p. 330.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] "A Message from the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches," The Evanston Report, p. 1.

[4] Loc. cit.

ii. Signs of Hope

Although the Evanston Report manifested an ecumenical consensus, nevertheless it came in for heavy criticism, especially in regard to what it left out: specific references to signs of hope and an acceptable treatment of creation and cosmic redemption. It was not enough for many delegates to say, "This world is anchored to Him with unshakeable hope,"[2] without pursuing concrete indications of what this involves. For Christians "hope is not just a hope for the end, but one which finds its constant realizations on the way."[3] There must be meaning for the work of man and the possibility to fulfil his human aspirations.

The setting of the third assembly of the World Council of Churches held at New Delhi, India, was a convincing argument in itself that human aspirations and signs of Christian hope needed to be explored more deeply. The problems of poverty, illiteracy, population explosion, disease, showed graphically that the task of the Church is unfinished. From the very beginning the delegates were faced with the problem of the Christian approach to non-Christian religions, and the role of the Church to minister to the common needs of mankind. As Dr. Paul Devanandan said in his address at the Assembly, "Christian witness cannot rest content with vague generalities, but must address itself to the concrete realities of the contemporaneous situation."[1] The Message of the Assembly to the Churches indicated the direction the World Council was following, stating that, "All over the world new possibilities of life, freedom and prosperity are being actively, even passionately, pursued,"[2] and "We have to learn to make a Christian contribution to the service of men through secular agencies."[3]

---

[1] "Evangelism: the Mission of the Church to those Outside Her Life," Report of Section Two, The Evanston Report, p. 108.

[2] "The Statement on the Report of the Advisory Committee," The Evanston Report, p. 71.

[3] John Marsh, The Significance of Evanston, (London: Independent Press, Ltd., 1954), p. 27.

When Uppsala spoke of hope, it did so with a great concern for the material needs of mankind. The focus now was strongly on the level of human values. The concerns of the World Council Conference on Church and Society, held in Geneva in July, 1966, were very much in evidence at Uppsala. The growing chasm between rich and poor, the continuing arms race, scientific advancement and revolutionary forces all endanger man. The churches were being challenged by theological questioning and criticism of their institutional stance. This attitude was clearly indicated in the Reports of the Assembly. The Report of Section Six, for example, states:

---

[1] James W. Kennedy, No Darkness at All (St. Louis, Mo.: The Bethany Press, 1962), p. 35.

[2] "The Message of the Assembly to the Churches," The New Delhi Report, p. 320.

[3] Ibid., p. 321.

> Some, looking at the Church, do not see it as a community of joyous people who have a hope and a message for the world, who are capable of forgiving, who fight for economic justice and human dignity, who are concerned for the sick and the despised, who support and defend the responsible freedom of scientific research and of the arts. We are often looked at as defenders of obsolete traditions and are solicited to provide comforting ceremonies at birth, marriage and death.[1]

The Report speaks of "the possibility to be co-workers with God in a creation stirred to newness by scientific and technical inventions."[2] The stress now is on development and change toward valid ends. The focus is larger than the personal; it is universal. "We are confronted with collective evil,"[3] and the Church, to be a sign of hope to the world, must attend to its needy. The Church exists in the certainty that "in Christ the new reconciled creation has already dawned," and now

---

[1] "Towards New Styles of Living," Report of Section Six, *The Uppsala Report*, p. 88.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

XUM

passes on towards the "hope that God will bring about salvation, justice and peace."[1] This demands of the churches a change in political activity and thought. It demands, also, cooperation with non-Christians who share the same goals, although Christians will make their particular contribution in an "unshakeable hope in him who says, "Behold, I make all things new."[2]

The concern, then, for Christian hope, resolves itself in the problematic area of the object of man's hope. In what is modern man to place his hopes? In his Report to the Uppsala Assembly, Dr. Eugene C. Blake, the General Secretary of the World Council recognizes that the Christian Church of today is called upon to make its own particular contribution to the solution of this problem, a solution which may not be exactly the same as that of the Church in another time, for "the world which is the arena of our witness is a new world, confused and confusing, rich and poor, materialistic and expectant, fearful and divided, interrelated and interdependent, as it has never been before."[3] There is a new stress today on the political, the social and the economic. Yet the failure of the churches to come to grips with this problem, and their theological variances in regard to the relationship of the Church to the Kingdom or to the degree to which the Kingdom is realized here and now, has led many to abandon the Church altogether, or to define its purpose in purely secular terms. For some, there must be an identification of the Gospel and the secular. Evangelism emerges as the participation of the Church in the development of human progress. Man's hope then lies in a world indefinitely progressing, and the appeal for man is to place his hopes in the new and constantly enlarging technological discoveries which will enlarge his mind, broaden his perspective and eliminate his age-old enemies of: disease, poverty, hunger, discrimination and the like. For Christ is acting everywhere within and without the Church.

---

[1] "Towards Justice and Peace in International Affiars," Report of Section Four, _ibid_., p. 60.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 61.

[3] "The Report of the General Secretary," _ibid_., p. 290.

For others, the Church, once looked upon as the obstacle to human progress and science and as a body more concerned with heavenly realities than with earthly matters, must now define itself in terms primarily secular if it is to be relevant and thereby credible. Certainly the world-shattering events of the first seven decades of the twentieth century and a revelation of man's inhumanity to man through war, injustice and exploitation demanded a reordering of the priorities of Christian discipleship, but how are Christians to insure that there is a need for something specifically Christian in their humanitarian

XUM

concerns? The Report of Section One in the Bristol Report put the problem succinctly: "How are we to understand the relation of the personal, social and cosmic dimensions of our eschatological hope."[1] The assembly at Uppsala continued to concern itself with this problem, and according to the Ecumenical Chronicle, this was one of the two theological issues that was "discussed sufficiently this year to prove that Uppsala did not say the last word on them."[2] The questioning at Uppsala became more specific, according to the Chronicle, "Does the Gospel, rightly understood eschatologically and historically, really support the present ecumenical preoccupation with social, economic and political questions such as the 'development' commitment of the Uppsala Assembly."[3] This was the problem facing the churches at Uppsala and one which is still being explored.

Dr. Nikos Nissiotis, writing after the Uppsala Assembly, in responding to this problem, says that, "Faced with the danger of identification between Gospel and secular...one should never forget the element of

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church," Report of Section One, New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 131.

[2] "The Report of the General Secretary," The Ecumenical Review, XXI (October, 1969), p. 33.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

discontinuity which is rooted in the world situation."[1] For Dr. Nissiotis, the point of departure is crucial, and this point is ecclesial. He says, "One must point out that the cosmic element of the Gospel can be grasped only through the Church as a focus, a *pars pro toto*..."[2] and without the Church as a microcosm of the restored cosmos there can be no evangelization in the light of universal salvation in Christ. He believes that, "the implications of the Incarnation are all too easily generalized. One should not forget that Christ is identical with the concrete historical person of Jesus of Nazareth."[3] For Nissiotis the danger of identifying Gospel and secular results from a generalized Christology, and this identification of the object of Christian hope as the building of a new world through the natural process of evolution, progress and development.

Teilhard's great objective in life was to give modern man hope. He gave emphasis to what he believed was lacking, a concern for and love of progress, science and technology. But the object of his hope was not progress or scientific achievement, but rather Jesus Christ through the Church as a *pars pro toto*. True progress, for

---

[1] Nikos Nissiotis, "The Pneumatological Aspect of the Catholicity of the Church," in *What Unity Implies*, p. 16.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 17.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 15.

Teilhard, was made on the level of the personal and the shaping of Man could come about only through the love of Christ overcoming the excess of sin and alienation in the human condition.

5. Summary

i. Question Facing Faith and Order

In viewing the Resurrection and Redemption not only in terms of the individual but in the more universal terms of completing creation and rescuing the world from alienation, Faith and Order is very much in the spirit of Teilhard's theologizing about these two Christian mysteries. For Teilhard the Resurrection was a key factor in understanding universal redemption. It was the Resurrection, seen under his usual cosmic perspective, that focused attention on re-creating aspects of redemption. As Faith and Order studies progressed questions about the relation between objective redemption and personal salvation arose[1] and the realization of the "cosmic dimensions of evil"[2] demanded an appropriate response. Related problems of redemption outside of the Church, spurred by the revival of non-Christian religions and the work of the secularists,

---

[1] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 206.

[2] "The Lordship of Christ," The Ecumenical Review, vol. XI (July, 1959), p. 440.

XUM

also called for study. A study of the relationship of redemption to the transformation of society became more acute as technology advanced and the world's ills were brought into sharper relief. The growing awareness of the world's unity led theologians to explore the connections between creation, redemption, and consummation within the framework of an historical process. So strong is the claim of unity that some maintain that Church unity itself must be a product of the world's reconciliation.

These expanding horizons have led Faith and Order to struggle with the question, "How are we to understand the relation of the personal, social and cosmic dimensions of our eschatological hope?"[1] asking whether the Gospel really supports the involvement of the Churches in the burning social, political, and economic questions of the day. This involves the relationship of hope here and now and the Christian's ultimate hope.

ii. Teilhard's Contribution

Teilhard explored the meaning of the dogma of redemption with a strong conviction that the Church had a profound responsibility for the common life of men and for the transformation of society. For him, involvement in the social, political and economic questions is required by the Gospel imperatives and is truly redemptive. His explanation of the concept of redemption was carried out within his cosmic perspective, and his recognition that the Church has often shunned its responsibilities to the world led him to believe that only a reversal of priority would give the Church the incentive to build the earth. For a theology of redemption to be responsive to the needs of the modern world, he thought it necessary to stress re-creation over reparation; to see redemption primarily as a creative effort. Creation and redemption, for him, are bound together in an evolutionary context. This demanded that he re-view such concepts as the nature of original sin, the meaning of grace, redemption, and even the meaning of the Cross in order to attach man more firmly to God and to the earth.

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," Report of Section One, New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 131.

Teilhard was formed in scholastic theology following the thought of St. Thomas and his interpreters, a system which demands a rigid distinction between the order of redemption and the order of creation and which stresses the distinction between creation and grace. Teilhard rejected this viewpoint and preferred to view the Incarnation within God's plan of creation and thereby stress continuity over distinction. This, he believed, was the correct perspective to involve both God and man in developing the earth and its possibilities.

Believing that traditionally theology has been almost exclusively concerned with atonement and reparation, Teilhard believed that the symbol of the Cross has reflected this. In giving priority to re-creation, he then is obliged to interpret the meaning of the Cross in this perspective. The Cross becomes a synthesis of the vertical and the horizontal, "the Above and the Ahead."[1] He believed this to be a transformation of the meaning of the Cross and not a denial or distortion of its traditional redemptive meaning. Teilhard stresses man's part in the redemptive process by this focus. He believed this would lead to an expansion of religion and an increase in Christian optimism. It would foster a humanistic revival in religion and link the Gospel to the personal, social, and cosmic dimensions of Christian hope.

In assessing the position of grace in God's plan, Teilhard saw it granted to man in virtue of creation. He saw grace as "the vital, organizing influence of the universe"[2] impregnating the very core of matter. His approach to the supernatural is phenomenological. He does not attempt to establish the necessity of the grace but accepts it as a fact of revelation. He believes that all of nature is oriented toward God. It is this intimate relationship of nature and grace, arising from his view of

---

[1] Teilhard, "Ce que le Monde attend de l'Église de Dieu," Comment Je Crois, p. 260.

[2] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p.57.

XUM

the Incarnation and his stress on creation over reparation, that Teilhard believes will lead Christians to embrace a "gospel of human conquest."[1] Teilhard was careful to distinguish between nature and grace in his own way. His desire was to show their harmony and correspondence. He was well aware of man's need of grace and of its gratuity. It is God's initiative and man's response. The conception of grace everywhere in the universe led him to re-examine the concept of original sin and expand it to place it in accord with cosmic redemption. It was his belief that the major obstacle to the Christian's involvement in the world was a narrow and constricted view of original sin. For Teilhard grace permeates the entire range of human activities. He does not reject a metaphysical analysis of grace but he does not concern himself with it. He is not concerned with the person as a _suppositum rationale_ but rather as a conscious being relating to other conscious beings. Christ has a central place in this transaction, but the traditional categories of natural and supernatural are scarcely treated by Teilhard.

For Teilhard, then, the theological foundation given to support the involvement of the Churches in the social, economic and political questions of the day can be found by stressing positive redemption over reparation,

---

[1] Teilhard, "Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World," in _Science and Christ_, p. 122.

XUM

and by linking creation with redemption. It is this which will neutralize the effects of too exclusive an emphasis on reparation and too great a distinction between creation and redemption; and urge the Christian to involvement in the world. This stress, however, is not without its own difficulties. In linking creation and redemption, one runs the risk of de-personalizing sin and neutralizing evil. To see all from a cosmic perspective may allow one the assurance of the ultimate victory of Christ but as Mooney points out, it runs the risk of neglecting "the level of immediate human experience."[1] It can call man to total involvement in the world by emphasizing the continuities between nature and grace or Creator and creation, but redemption is also salvation, a passage from loss to recovery. The Cross is not only a symbol of progress, it is also a pardon and a return to grace. The discontinuous in history is a glaring reality demanding attention.

Teilhard can offer valuable insights to Faith and Order theologians and point out a needed direction. Redemption as creation can give man a passionate taste for the world and can move him to his Christian task in the world, but never without the full partnership of redemption as reparation. Man is still estranged from God and from his fellow Man and this reconciliation must first occur if cosmic redemption is to become a reality.

---

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 205.

CHAPTER VI

THE CHURCH

1. Teilhard's Concept

In an article published in 1948 Teilhard revealed his conception of the Church and its role in the world. He stated that "the Church is neither an Epi- nor a Para-phenomenon in the growth of the Human Social Organism, but constitutes the very Axis (or Nucleus) about which it forms."[1] His basis for this statement was the Christian teaching that the perfection of men lies in the organic union of all men with God, and it is union with Christ that effects this. Teilhard's view was not a static one, but one constantly exploring the dynamic aspect of a world in progress. He saw Christ as the Center of the evolutionary process and he saw also human unity brought about by the emergence of thought and personalization. Life, he believed, was the central phenomenon of evolution, and human reflection life's central phenomenon. The essential phenomenon of man he saw as socialization resulting in personalization. It was his task to probe the relationship between Christ and mankind. He saw Christ and the Church as central and necessary to the success of the development of the world. The world was yet unfinished. The Body of Christ must be built up. He saw Christ as the center of the Church and the Church as central to the completion of the world through Christ. His task was to attempt a synthesis between human progress to build the earth, and Christian charity which builds up the body of Christ. For him the purpose of Christian activity was to synthesize these two forces. His exploration of the Church's role in human progress was based on the absolute necessity and centrality of the Church to such progress. He believed that "By definition and principle it is the specific function of the Church to Christianize all that is human in Man,"[1] and that Christians have not "sufficiently measured the powers of growth with which Christ endowed his Church..."[2] Teilhard's concern was to explore this function of the Church and the powers of growth inherent in it.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis?", in The Future of Man, p. 223.

Teilhard's view of Christianity is always a dynamic one corresponding to his evolutionary bias. He sees Christianity essentially as a movement effecting unity in the world through the activity of Jesus Christ. Christianity continues Christ's redemptive work from the Resurrection to the Parousia. It proclaims Jesus Christ

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," ibid., p. 265.

[2] Teilhard, "A Note on Progress," ibid., p. 22.

XUM

as the concrete link binding all things together.

Teilhard is concerned primarily with analyzing Christianity's unitive function not only in relation to Christian activity in the world but also to the union of all men with God. He says "In its essence, Christianity consists in regarding the history of the world as corresponding to the following process: A supreme I (or Me), a hyper-personal God, incorporates in itself, without destroying their identity, the human 'I's', in and through the 'Christic I'."[1]

It is this dynamic aspect that eventually led Teilhard to say that "at the very heart of the social phenomenon, a kind of ultra-socialization is in progress: that whereby the 'Church' is being formed little by little, vivifying by its influence and collecting under their sublimest form all the energies of the Noosphere;..."[2] The Church is the form of this Christian current. It is where the source of the energy uniting all things is recognized as such. It is the unique place, the Christ-centered community, where the union of men in the love of God has already been realized. In the Church the unity of the human family is not only proclaimed but is lived.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Some General Views on the Essence of Christianity," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 133.

[2] Teilhard, Comment Je Vois, n.p.

XUM

i. Church and Evolution

The Church in the evolutionary view of Teilhard has become the axis of evolution. As the axis of evolution passed through man, the apex of the evolutionary process, and then through Christ who assumed the direction of evolution by his immersion at the Incarnation and his resurrection from the dead, now the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ becomes the axis. The presence of Christ now "radiates from _an historical centre_ and is transmitted along _a traditional and solidly defined axis_."[1] The Church represents the presence in history of Jesus Christ who is also Omega, the term of the historical process. It is this reality of the Body of Christ, the Christian phenomenon of the Church, which is capable of carrying the thrust of evolution to its final end.

Teilhard's theory of evolution posits the fundamental understanding that evolution has a line of direction and orientation. Because he is reflective, and evolution is convergent, man is oriented to a future point of maximum consciousness and progress. This is Omega, irreversible and personal. Teilhard, as a Christian, and relying on revelation, identifies this with Christ. Christianity and evolution are not two opposing views, but rather two perspectives which complement one another. If the world

---

[1] Teilhard, _The Divine Milieu_, p. 94.

XUM

is to mature and to be saved, this will happen only through Christ and through his Body the Church. God makes use of the evolutionary process to effect his will and Teilhard sees the Church as "impregnating, taking possession of, and gradually uplifting the rising mass of the world."[1]

Teilhard considered Christianity in its cosmic proportions just as he did so many other things. He directed his concern to the relationship between the cosmos and Christ. His concept of the Church is given a central place in the evolutionary process, as he sees it.

> Across the immensity of time and the disconcerting multiplicity of individuals, one single operation is taking place: The annexation to Christ of His Chosen; one single thing is being made: the Mystical Body of Christ...[2]

But he did not develop a systematic ecclesiology as an extension of his Christology. He saw the Church as a moving force acting as a source of love in the world. It was through the Church that the force of Christian love entered mankind to carry it to its end. It was this aspect of ecclesiology that commanded his attention. He believed that other aspects had received undue consideration from theologians. It was because of this that he made what de Lubac says may be his harshest judgment ever.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Outline of a Dialectic of Spirit," in Activation of Energy, p. 149.

[2] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 124.

XUM

> The Church will waste away so long as she does not escape from the factitious world of verbal theology, of quantitative sacramentalism, and over-refined devotions in which she is enveloped, so as to reincarnate herself in the real aspirations of mankind..."[1]

Teilhard believed that modern man was awakening to the increased possibilities coincident with the increasing dimensions of the universe and felt that "Sooner or later souls will end by giving themselves to the religion which activates them most as human beings."[2] His interest in the Church was strongly oriented to its task in developing human beings more fully and its role in completing the world. He summed up his view of the Church in the following manner:

> The Church, that Christified part of the world aware of itself as such;--the Church, principal focus of interhuman relationships through the intensity of its charity,--the Church, central axis of universal convergence...[3]

At the very core of mankind a process of socialization, more intense than that process usually accompanying the growth of spirit, is taking place and it is the Church which is the locus of this phenomenon. It is the Church which moves mankind toward unity.

---

[1] Lubac, "The Trial of Faith," in Letters to Léontine Zanta, trans. by Bernard Wall (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 34.

[2] Teilhard, "The Contingence of the Universe," in Christianity and Evolution, trans. by René Hague (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), p. 228.

[3] Teilhard, Comment Je Vois, n.p.

XUM

(1) Phylum of Love

Teilhard was convinced that "the essence of Christianity is neither more nor less than a belief in the unification of the world in God by the Incarnation."[1] He saw this unification as an ongoing process and termed the Church "a 'phylum' of love in nature"[2] giving life and growing in consciousness. Teilhard borrowed this term from zoology where it indicates a living 'bundle' forming an individualized species. It is a collective reality possessing a dynamic nature which develops autonomously. He says "If we say it behaves 'like a living thing' this is no mere figure of speech, though it does so in its own way; it grows and flourishes."[3]

In applying this term to the Church, Teilhard is asserting that phenomenonologically the Church acts as a living collective reality within the living collective reality of mankind. It is a life within human life progressing in the same direction. It is a movement carrying the entire evolutionary process to its term which is Christ. He says, "Considered objectively as a phenomenon, the Christian movement, through its rootedness in the past and ceaseless developments, exhibits the characteristics

---

[1] Teilhard, "Sketch of a Personalistic Universe," in Human Energy, p. 91.

[2] Teilhard, "Human Energy," in Human Energy, p. 158.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 115.

XUM

of a phylum."[1] From revelation Teilhard accepts the Church as the living Body of Christ which has taken root in the Incarnation and grows to fulness.

For Teilhard the term phylum is an analogous one. It is a bundle of lines of evolutionary development, a collective reality growing and flourishing like a living organism. But he uses this term to show that the Church is not extrinsic to the human phenomenon but is at its very core. He states "the Christian phylum is not an accessory or divergent shoot in the human social organism, but constitutes the axis itself of socialisation."[2] He uses this analogy also to highlight his belief that Christianity is not a fixed or static system but is in continuous development. Christianity holds the answer to man's evolutionary progress because of the presence of Christ and the principle of reconciling love.

(2) Union Through Love

In applying the law of complexity-consciousness and the principle that union differentiates, to human persons, Teilhard affirmed that the more the process of socialization increased, the more opportunity there was for a person to become more truly himself. What unites persons is love. For Teilhard love alone can unite human beings by joining them in what is deepest in themselves. He says "it is the specific effect of love to accentuate the individuality of the beings it associates more closely."[1] The center of the Church is Christ who draws all to himself through love. In the Church where persons are united center to center through love there is a greater urge to hominisation. Christianity alone can foster this progress in love because it can personalize the individual while drawing him into a closer unity through Christ. As Teilhard says, "_Alone_, unconditionally alone, in the world today, Christianity shows itself able to reconcile, in a single living act, the All and the Person."[2] If the many are ever to become one it can only be achieved in the Church because the Church is the Body of Christ and through love individuals are called to develop themselves as fully as possible in true union. In Teilhard's view "true union does not fuse the elements it brings together... It is egoism that hardens and neutralizes the human stuff. _Union differentiates_."[3]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 298.

[2] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis?", in *The Future of Man*, p. 215.

Mankind is called to unity and to progress and it is only through the Church that this will be accomplished definitively for the Church is the place where

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in _Christianity and Evolution_, p. 171.

[2] Teilhard, _The Phenomenon of Man_, p. 297.

[3] Teilhard, "Sketch of a Personalistic Universe," in _Christianity and Evolution_, p. 63.

"a genuine universal love has not only been conceived and preached, but has also been shown to be psychologically possible and operative in practice."[1]

(3) Uniqueness

In setting forth this view of the Church, Teilhard left no doubt that its essential feature was the primacy of love reconciling person to person. Love was not a secondary effect superimposed upon the creative process, but an expression of its fundamental dynamism. The basic message of Christ, he believes, resides "in the affirmation that God, a personal being, presents Himself to man as the goal of a personal union."[2] He felt that too often the Christian phenomenon was misrepresented by those who would mistake its secondary effects for its primary teaching. Awakening in man the sense of his personal dignity, or establishing codes of personal behavior he saw as secondary effects of the Christian message. What established Christianity as unique and definitive is the Incarnation and the message: God as love, and only to be finally reached in love; this is the psychological revolution, and the secret of the triumph of Christianity."[3]

The basis of the uniqueness of the Church is the

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 296.

[2] Teilhard, "Human Energy," in Human Energy, p. 156.

[3] Ibid., p. 157.

Incarnation recognized "by acceptance of an affirmation received from on high."[1] Because Christ is its center, for the believer

> ...a difference and a radical advance can easily be distinguished, which permanently set 'the Christian phenomenon' apart from every single one of the other 'religious phenomena' among which it appeared but which it has continually, ever since its origins, bean striving to shake off.[2]

Christianity is superior to other religions because it is personal as well as universalist having the "capacity of harmonising with the whole physical and psychological order of our universe...."[3] It is open to the future and can accommodate itself to the challenges of modern technology and the aspirations of modern man enabling men to discover God in the cosmic dimensions of a world in movement. It is "eminently the religion of the imperishable and the personal"[4] which, because Christ is its center, will bring the world to its consummation.

Teilhard believed that Christianity is the only religion that gives complete understanding and sense to matter, history, and the concept of evolution. In reflecting

---

[1] Teilhard, "Outline of a Dialectic of Spirit," in Activation of Energy, p. 149.

[2] Teilhard, "The Christian Phenomenon," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 207.

[3] Teilhard, "Christianity in the World," in Science and Christ, p. 110.

[4] Teilhard, "How I Believe," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 125.

XUM

on non-Christian religions, Teilhard wrote that "there is a vast quantity of goodness and beauty outside the Church, which will come to fruition, no doubt, only in Christ."[1] Evolution continues along the axis of Christianity and all other world religions will eventually converge on this axis. His vision of the only possible religion of the future was one where there is "A general convergence of religions upon a universal Christ who fundamentally satisfies them all."[2]

ii. Church and Rome

In treating of the Church as phylum, Teilhard gave considerable stress to the importance of cephalization. Organisms first become individualized and personalized by this process. He also was strongly influenced by the ecclesial stance of the Roman Catholic Church which identified the Church of Christ with the Roman Catholic Church. For Teilhard the Church phylum is always the Roman Catholic Church. This claim of being the only authentic expression of Christianity "is not an unjustified pretension but meets an inevitable organic need."[3]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Letter of 19 June, 1926," in Letters From a Traveller, p. 125.

[2] Teilhard, "How I Believe," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 130.

[3] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 167.

It was a concern for wholeness and for unity which led him to make this identification. In an essay discussing the general convergence of religions, he states "In the matter of religion, just as in that of cerebration, the cosmic forces of complexification, it would seem, proceed not through individuals but through complete branches."[1] He was here adopting a neutral viewpoint but he explains in a footnote that if he were to speak as a Catholic he would have to say that the Church "by structural necessity" must regard itself as the axis of complexification and as the complete branch. His theological viewpoint was that other Christians lack unity in this cephalized manner, and he even speaks of them as a sub-phylum which branched off from the Roman Catholic Church.

It was this cephalic aspect of the Church which Teilhard saw as necessary if the Church is to give guidance and direction to mankind's fulfillment and it was this completeness which made the Church an infallible guide. He says

> ...to say that the Church is infallible is simply to say that, in virtue of being a living organism, the Christian group contains in itself, and to an emminent degree, a certain sense of direction and certain potentialities--ill-defined though these are, they enable it to grope its way, constantly probing in this direction or in that, to maturity

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Zest for Living," in Activation of Energy, p. 241.

and self-fulfilment.[1]

Whether one locates infallibility in the Councils or in the Pope "formulating and expressing not his own ideas but those of the Church"[2] it is perfectly in keeping with the law of cephalization. Teilhard recognizes that

> There are, no doubt, many individuals outside Catholicism who recognize and love Christ, and are therefore united to him, as much as (and even more than) some Catholics. But these individuals are not grouped together in the 'cephalized' unity of a body which reacts vitally, as an organic whole, to the combined forces of Christ and mankind.[3]

For Teilhard "To be Catholic is the only way of being fully and utterly Christian"[4] because it is only in the Catholic current that there is flexibility enough to synthesize the old and the new which can lead the way of true Christian humanism.

Mooney points out that Teilhard's concept of the Church as a phylum of love marked a turning point in Teilhard's theology. He had previously explored the concept of Christ as universal center and "This concept of Christ as organic Centre is now to be fused with that of the Church as organic phylum...."[5] This led him to the concept of Christogenesis and to a greater stress on Christology. This concentration on Christology modified somewhat his ecclesial views giving more prominence to the role of Christ in the Church and less to the structure of the Church. In his final work on Christology this trend is reflected when he says

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 153.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 168.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 160.

> In truth, no religious faith either now or at any moment in history has ever released a greater warmth, a more intense dynamism for unification, than Christianity (the more it is Catholic) at this moment.[1]

2. Role of the Church

The role of the Church was central to the unification of mankind and the completion of the world. The world was incomplete and had to be brought to its fulfilment. The Body of Christ must also be built up to its fulness. These processes of unification would be carried out through the Church. It was through the Church that Christian love enters the world to unite it and redeem it. And it was through the sacrament of the Eucharist that the Christian comes into contact with the very core of this redemptive process.

i. Eucharistic Community

In adhering to a traditional Catholic view of sacraments, Teilhard believes that they are "more than

---

[1] Teilhard, Le Christique, p. 8.

XUM

a symbolic rite."[1] He views them as having an "organic function"[2] and in his cosmic and evolutionary perspective they have an organic and unifying function as well. Teilhard saw the Eucharist as the central sacrament in the Christian phenomenon and early in his writings was speculating on the Eucharist and the presence of Christ. It was not the usual theological speculation about the mode of Christ's presence but speculation about the cosmic presence of Christ and its relation to the Eucharist. He accepted and used the term transubstantiation but concentrated his efforts on the wider presence of Christ through the Eucharist.

In the first of Teilhard's extant writings to reflect his cosmic concern, in a characteristic manner, he begins with the conviction that "each one of us is perforce linked by all the material, organic and psychic strands of his being to all that surrounds him."[3] He wishes to impart the vision "of the inexpressible Cosmos of matter and of the new life, the Body of Christ, real and mystical, unity and multiplicity, monad and pleiad."[4] The Eucharist has a central place in this vision.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 165.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Teilhard, Introduction to the essay, "Cosmic Life," in Writings in Time of War, p. 14.

[4] Ibid., p. 16.

Teilhard viewed the Incarnation as the penetration of the Divine into human nature, and through grace man became "identified with one and the same higher Reality, which is Jesus Christ."[1] By means of the Eucharist Christ "consummates the union of the faithful in Himself." He "organizes us for himself and implants himself in us."[2] The Eucharist is the real presence of Christ organizing and uniting the community sharing the life of grace. The presence of Jesus divinizes the universe and it is the power of the Eucharist that "gradually gathers into himself all the unitive energy scattered throughout his creation."[3]

The presence of Christ in the universe will bring about its eventual transfiguration. Christ through his Incarnation has become an 'element' in the universe and as the first-born of all creation, has assumed its leadership. He is "the Center of Creation, the Force that can subject all things to itself, the term by which all things are informed."[4] There is now "a certain relationship that _All being_ has to Christ...."[5] All things "converge upon him and so reach their fulfilment in him, in the Pleroma."[1] There will be a long process of growth but "From the cosmic element into which he has entered, the Word is active to master and assimilate to himself all that still remains."[2] For Teilhard the Eucharist takes on its "ultimate significance in the individualization of the Universal Element in which the Incarnation consists."[3] The presence of Christ through all reality is assured by his commanding position as Universal Center. The Eucharist continues this presence allowing Christ to penetrate creation and draw all to himself in some way completing himself. This is what Teilhard is trying to express when he says "Of the cosmic Christ, we may say both that he is and that he is entering into fuller being."[4]

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 50.

[2] _Loc_. _cit_.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 51.

[4] Teilhard, "The Universal Element," _ibid_., p. 297.

[5] _Loc_. _cit_.

ii. The Divine Milieu

In tracing the development of Teilhard's thought on the Eucharist, Mooney notes that he gradually began to add the term 'physical' to the notion of the universal presence[5] in an attempt to clarify his understanding and add substance to his thought. It is through the universal power of the Eucharist that the influence of Christ is transmitted to man. The Eucharist is "the natural continuation of Christ's redemptive and unitive act."[1] But The Host (that is, the real presence of Christ) is still too often presented as a localised, external element...no more than temporary...."[2] If a person is to grasp the fundamental position of the Eucharist in the economy of the World, he must concern himself with "the real, and physical, extensions of the Eucharistic Presence."[3] Christ, through the Eucharist, is assimilating the world to himself. The Eucharist must be seen in its extension, its cosmic dimension as permeating reality and gradually transfiguring the earth. This Eucharistic understanding leads Teilhard to say that although the primary body of Christ is confined to the Eucharistic species, secondarily "the matter of the Sacrament in the world, throughout which there spreads, so to complete itself, the superhuman presence of the universal Christ."[4]

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] Teilhard, "The Priest," *ibid.*, p. 207.

[3] Teilhard, "The Universal Element," *ibid.*, p. 298.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

[5] Mooney, *Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ*, p. 82.

In his work *The Divine Milieu* written in 1927 Teilhard concentrates strongly on the physical extensions

---

[1] Teilhard, "My Universe," in *Science and Christ*, p. 82.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

[4] *Loc. cit.*

XUM

of the Eucharistic presence. Teilhard, through his Christian faith, believes that by means of the Resurrection, the Body of Christ became co-extensive with the cosmos. Through the Incarnation, the Body of Christ was organically bound to the cosmos and by the Eucharist incorporation into that body becomes actualized. He affirmed the individual reality of Christ in the Eucharistic species, but believed also that "the great sacramental operation does not cease at that local and momentary event."[1]

Concentrating on the unique act of the continuing Incarnation and the living Christ, he considers individual Eucharistic celebrations "diversely central points,"[2] fixing in space and time the continuous act of the Incarnation. He says

> ...from the beginning of the Messianic preparation, up till the Parousia, passing through the historic manifestation of Jesus and the phases of growth of His Church, a single event has been developing in the world: The Incarnation, realised, in each individual, through the Eucharist.[3]

Accepting the Christian teaching about the centrality of Christ and his role in the cosmos and rejecting an extreme individualism in sacramental theology, especially in regard to the central sacrament of the Eucharist, Teilhard

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 102.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

wants to emphasize not only that "the human layer of the earth is wholly and continuously under the organizing influx of the Incarnate Christ,"[1] but also that "the Eucharistic Christ controls--from the point of view of the organisation of the Pleroma...the whole movement of the universe...."[2] Following the thought of Gregory of Nyssa, which he found quite compatible with his own view of the relationship of the world and the Eucharist, he says:

> As our humanity assimilates the material world, and as the Host assimilates our humanity, the Eucharistic transformation goes beyond and completes the transubstantiation of the bread on the altar.[3]

Because Christ is the Universal Element not subject to limitation he can be present to all believers and unite himself to all. In this way Christ saves mankind and brings about the Pleroma.

iii. In Christogenesis

Teilhard wrote on the Eucharist only twice after the publication of The *Divine Milieu*. One text was published in 1944, the other in 1955 just before his death. In an essay published in 1938 he began to explore the concept of genesis in connection with Christ. In addressing the Christian humanist who accepts the Incarnation he says "There is neither separation nor discordance, but coherent subordination, between the genesis of Mankind in the World and the genesis of Christ in Mankind through His Church."[1] It was inevitable that as he developed his concept of Christogenesis the Eucharist should be linked centrally with this process.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 103.

[2] *Loc*. *cit*.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 104.

He continues to stress the unity and extension of Eucharistic communion saying that all Eucharistic celebrations are "successive instants or episodes in one single communion--in one and the same process of Christification,"[2] but now believes that this can be further clarified. In its total operation the Eucharist is "the manifestation of God's unifying energy applied individually to each spiritual atom of the universe."[3] He says

> To adhere to Christ in the eucharist is inevitably and _ipso facto_ to incorporate ourselves a little more fully on each occasion in a Christogenesis, which itself...is none other than the soul of universal cosmogenesis.[4]

He sees the Eucharist as "the sacrament of our life, experienced and mastered, in its individual modalities

---

[1] Teilhard, "Social Heredity and Progress," in _The Future of Man_, p. 34.

[2] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in _Christianity and Evolution_, p. 166.

[3] _Loc. cit._

[4] _Loc. cit._

XUM

as well as in its cosmic extension,"[1] through which Christ "acquires and develops, in the fullest sense, a real omnipresence of transformation."[2]

iv. Body of Christ

Teilhard accepted the concept of the Body of Christ with the intention of exploring all its possibilities and with the conviction that he was always speaking of the concrete Body-Person of the historical Jesus of Nazareth revealed through the Scriptures. From the beginnings of his writings, however, he rejected any concept of the Body of Christ that was not organic. Those who view the Body of Christ in a moral or logical relationship to man or in a relationship "more akin to a social aggregation than to a natural organism...dangerously weaken the thought of Scripture and make it unintelligible or platitudinous to thinking men...."[3] Such people "unjustifiably diminish Christ and the profoundly real mystery of his Flesh."[4] He refused to accept the concept of the Body of Christ as merely an extrinsic or juridical association of men. He saw this view as timid and erroneous and one not worthy of

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 167.

[2] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in _Writings in Time of War_, p. 49.

[3] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in _Writings in Time of War_, p. 49.

[4] _Loc. cit_.

XUM

Christianity. He believed "It must be understood with boldness, as St. John and St. Paul and the Fathers saw it and loved it."[1]

Teilhard believed that in an evolutionary universe yet unfinished, and in a universe of profound dimensions, the Christological approach best suited to explaining the place of Christ was the approach through the organic Body of Christ. To explore Christ and the cosmos was his task, and to interpret the Body of Christ as a metaphor would rob Teilhard of his most potent arguments. It was his concern for the cosmic aspect of salvation and the need of man to be united with the Body of Christ which led him to concentrate on this relationship and not for Christ's relationship to the Church. It was this same reason which led Teilhard to probe the relationship of the Eucharist and the cosmos and not the Eucharist and the Church. At the basis of his entire system Teilhard posits a cosmology to explain the mode of Christ's action in the world. The total mystery of Christ is to be rethought in terms of becoming, and in the framework of Teilhard, this eventuates in Christogenesis when the concept of the Church as a phylum of love is joined to the concept of the Body of Christ as organic center.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

3. Faith and Order and the Church

In calling the churches to unity, the planners of the Lausanne Conference realized that the Church itself would have to be a major topic of discussion since there was such division among the churches at that time. The Subjects Committee, meeting in 1923 to plan for Lausanne were not unaware of the Lambeth Quadrilateral formulated some fifty years before,[1] and this statement undoubtedly influenced their planning. The fact of Christian division was obvious, but the depth and the causes were as yet not fully known or explored. The churches could agree that, "the Christian Church is constituted by the eternal Word of God made man in Christ and is always vitalised by his Holy Spirit,"[2] and that its task is "to proclaim and bear witness to this Word throughout the world by its preaching, its worship, and its whole life,"[3] yet the marked differences in the Faith and Order of the churches made salient the need to examine the differences and agreements. This becomes evident if the goal of Christian unity is seen as "the full

---

[1] Robert H. Gardiner, ed., Subjects Committee Papers, circulated in preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order (Gardiner, Maine: R. H. Gardiner, 1923).

[2] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," Chapter Three, The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 230.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

organic union of all Christians in one Church."[1]

The method adopted at Lausanne and in subsequent studies was that of comparative ecclesiology, a methodology which was to perdure until Lund. While possessing many values and being, perhaps, the only feasible approach to be used at this time, it was an approach limited to a description of the Church. If, "The Church of the Living God is constituted by His own will, not by the will or consent or beliefs of men whether as individuals or societies...,"[2] then the discovery of this Church of which Jesus Christ is the Head, will demand more than comparison. It will demand growth. The topic of Section III of the Conference: the Nature of the Church, seemed a promising step in the right direction.

What Lausanne revealed was:

> (1) That an almost impossible chasm separated the mentality of people born and bred in the "Catholic" tradition, and (2) that the most immediate question concerning the Church was whether the Church is based on Holy Scripture, or whether upon Tradition in addition to Scripture.[3]

The Continuation Committee solicited responses to the Conference Report from the churches. It became obvious that more study committees would be needed. The problem of the Church and the Churches was set before the theologians. Edinburgh, ten years later, would adopt a program on "the Church in the Purpose of God."

---

[1] Leonard Hodgson, ed., Convictions (London: S.C.M., 1934), p. 5.

[2] "The Nature of the Church," Report of Section Three, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 463.

[3] Edward Sydney Woods, Lausanne, 1927, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1927), p. 53-70.

Edinburgh attempted to build on the foundation laid at Lausanne, but it hoped to produce a report different from that issued at Lausanne. There was to be an affirmation of the unity underlying the churches, an affirmation prompted by the threatening challenge of the world situation. The Conference hoped to produce a series of confidential reports to the churches, in which it would "record and commend to their consideration such progress as we shall have been able to make in our joint studies towards overcoming the obstacles which hinder us all from full unity."[1]

Edinburgh reaffirmed the divine institution of the Church and its description in New Testament imagery and as "the people of the new covenant," the "household of God," and the "body of Christ."[2] It is a "visible body...to which is entrusted the ministry of reconciliation."[3] As at Lausanne, agreements and disagreements were duly recorded. But perhaps the most significant conclusion of the Edinburgh Conference was that:

---

[1] Programme for the Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Continuation Committee (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935), p. 6.

[2] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," Chapter Three, The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 230.

[3] Ibid., p. 231

> behind all particular statements of the problem of corporate union lie deeply divergent conceptions of the Church. For the want of any more accurate terms this divergence might be described as the contrast between "authoritarian" and "personal" types of Church,[1]

a problem which can also be expressed as, "The problem of the authority of the Scriptures and the modes of its interpretation."[2]

Edinburgh exposed the center of the problem of unity, the problem of the Church. The Continuation Committee determined to pursue the problem and at Clarens in 1939, elected R. Newton Flew chairman of the theological committee and chose "The Nature of the Church" for the subject of its study.[3]

i. Amsterdam

When the Amsterdam Conference was held in 1948, the Continuation Committee had become the World Council's Commission of Faith and Order. In the report given in preparation for the first meeting of the World Council of Churches, Dr. Flew confirmed again that the division of the various ecclesial positions could be expressed in the two categories of "catholic" and "protestant," "those for whom there is a fixed form of the Church that cannot be departed from without departing from the will of God" and "Those who hold that all forms which the Church has held have only functional significance."[1] The Report of the activities of the formative period of the World Council of Churches recognized that "the reunion of Christendom will require a reconciliation of these two views"[2] which the Assembly itself labeled "our deepest difference."[3]

---

[1] "The Church's Unity in Life and Worship," Chapter Four, ibid., p. 257.

[2] Ibid., p. 258.

[3] Minutes of the Meetings, Clarens, Part I, Sec. III, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1939), p. 32.

The Report acknowledged the impossibility of describing either tendency in a brief fashion without doing injustice to it, but it did state that in the Catholic tradition, the visible continuity of the Church in the apostolic succession of the episcopacy received primary emphasis while the protestant tradition stressed the initiative of the Word of God and the believer's response in faith.[4]

Amsterdam recognized, also, that some of the differences concerning Church and Ministry were rooted in "the relation of the visible church to 'the new creation' in Christ,"[1] a theme which was receiving increasing attention from theologians concerned with ecclesiology.

---

[1] World Conference on Faith and Order Continuation Committee (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1948), p. 7.

[2] World Council of Churches, The Ten Formative Years (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1948), p. 23.

[3] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 204.

[4] Ibid., p. 205.

The strong emphasis given by the World Council of Churches to ecclesiology led to uneasiness on the part of some of the churches and called forth a statement from the Central Committee that the World Council "is not a Super-Church. It is not the World Church. It is not the Una Sancta of which the Creeds speak."[2] Yet it felt constrained to affirm that "the World Council does not imagine a Church which one cannot see or touch, which would be only spiritual,"[3] although it does not exclude churches for whom the Church is essentially invisible.

ii. Lund: Methodology

The Lund Conference began to reflect the results of theologians studying the problems of ecclesiology, as the studies of New Testament imagery began to make an impact. At Lund the concept of the Church as the Body of Christ and the Church as the people of God were both given strong emphasis and "the distinction between 'catholic' and 'protestant' ecclesiology began to be blurred..."[1] The results of biblical theology which was especially characteristic of the theological scholarship in the years between Edinburgh and Lund, and the introduction of dialectical theology, shifting the emphasis of Faith and Order methodology, combined to place the chief emphasis of the unity of the Church upon the relationship of Christ to the Church. A common Christology was to be sought as the foundation of a common ecclesiology as Lund urged that, "the doctrine of the Church be treated in close relation both to the doctrine of Christ and to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 206.

[2] "The Church, the Churches and the World Council of Churches: The Toronto Statement," *Minutes of the Meeting of the Central Committee, Toronto*, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1950), p. 85.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 86. This remark was made in reference to the encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, which commented on the error of a spiritualized conception of unity.

Eschatology played an increasing role in Faith and Order thinking as Lund spoke of the Church as a new creation, living as a pilgrim community of forgiven sinners awaiting the redemption of the body, but already participating in the new life of Christ. Lund stated that "the Church belongs essentially to the new age and the new creation,"[3] and "the new age of the future is already present and through union with the risen Jesus Christ the Church on earth is already given to participate in the power of the resurrection."[1] For "Christ is the Head and He unites all believers in Himself,"[2] and "dwelling in the midst of His Church as Lord and King He will come again to judge the quick and the dead and to consummate the eternal Kingdom of God in the whole creation."[3]

---

[1] J. Robert Nelson, "Toward an Ecumenical Ecclesiology," Theological Studies, Vol. XXXI, no. 4 (December, 1970), p. 651.

[2] "Christ and His Church - The Report," The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 22.

[3] "Christ and His Church," Report of Section Two, ibid., p. 238.

Lund marked a new point of departure from concern of the nature of the Church itself to a concern to explore the relationship of the Church to Christ, its Head. Christology became the central problem to be examined, and this was a major theological task for the churches theologians. The profound influence of non-theological factors was also brought to light at Lund, and the ills of the world, such as poverty, racism, anti-Christian communism, gave a strong emphasis to the need for a common Christian service to the world. The task of the Church became a more prominent concern, and the nature of the Church a less prominent factor. Christian hope was the theme to be dealt with at Evanston and its relationship to the eschatological character of the Church would occupy the attention of the Second World Council Assembly.

This shift of methodology and focus at Lund enhanced the possibility for Teilhard's theology to benefit Faith and Order studies treating of the Church. The attention of Faith and Order turned to Christology as a basis for pursuing Church unity. Eschatology became more prominent. The task of the Church in the world needed clarification and exploration. These three areas are treated in depth by Teilhard and are areas in which he could offer valuable insights. As Crespy points out "the 'cosmos' is related to 'theos' by the 'Christos'. This is the basic insight of the thought of Teilhard."[1] This insight impelled Teilhard to explore the task of the Church in the world and the Church's relation to the unity of mankind, an exploration currently engaging Faith and Order theologians.

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

[3] "Christ and His Church," Report of Section One, *ibid.*, p. 237.

The World Council had made it perfectly clear at Toronto that it was not based on any one particular conception of the Church and that it would not prejudge the ecclesiological question. The emphasis in Evanston's Report, "Our Oneness in Christ and Our Disunity as Churches" fell upon the notion of Christian unity rather than the nature of the Church, but it reflected Lund's biblical and Christological approach. It was noted in general observations concerning this section that, "The Evanston Report is thus recognized as a first fruit of the Lund Conference,"[2] since it studied Church unity in the light of the biblical witness to God's saving work in Jesus Christ. The Orthodox delegates, in their comments on Section One, stated that the first part of the document "contains an able exposition of the New Testament doctrine of the Church,"[1] although the whole approach to reunion was not acceptable to them.

---

[1] Georges Crespy, From Science to Theology, p. 36.

[2] World Council of Churches, Response to Evanston, p. 13.

The short period of time between Lund and Evanston allowed very little time for the development of the eschatological character of the Church cited at Lund. The delegates at Evanston felt the need to speak together as one, but they were not concerned to speak about the nature of the Church, but rather about the tasks facing the Church, The beginning and the ending of the whole discussion was the purpose of God and the meaning of His revelation in Christ, which "in turn raised questions concerning the nature of His Kingdom on earth and the place of the Church in relation to it."[2]

iii. Christology

Study still continued about the nature of the Church, however. The members of the American section of Faith and Order had agreed to prepare papers on "the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ within the context of the different ways in which the New Testament speaks of Christ, and of the Church."[1] There was also concern to explore the relation of the Church and the world as well as the Church and the Parousia.[2]

---

[1] "The Declaration of the Orthodox Delegates Concerning Faith and Order," The Evanston Report, pp. 92-93.

[2] "Introduction," The Evanston Report, p. 6.

There was a shift, however, at Lund away from the nature of the Church to the task of the Church, and it made itself felt at New Delhi where the intention was to carry the thought of the Toronto Statement a step further, not by viewing its statement on unity as a definition of the Church, "but by suggesting for further study an attempt to express more clearly the nature of our common goal."[3] At Lund the delegates expressed the belief that unity could come through a study of the work and the person of Jesus Christ which would determine the nature of the Church and the ministerial form it would take. This Christological basis was not without its critics. Richard Niebuhr believed that "so much emphasis was laid on the work of Christ that the other two persons of the Trinity fade into the background,"[4] a view shared by some Orthodox. And Niebuhr also called to mind the danger of introverted ecclesiology, recalling that when one speaks of the unity of the Church, one should also remember the unity of all things in Christ.[1] At New Delhi a close relationship is implied between the nature of the Church as the Body of Christ and the quality of the unity sought. The visibility of the Church is a leading concern at New Delhi, but mainly as a sign of Christian unity. The primary emphasis is practical and the mission of the Church preempts concern with the nature of the Church. There is increased awareness of the task of the Church to evangelize the world, a task demanding Christian universalism, the basis of which must be "the common affirmation of the centrality of Christ and a common conception of the nature and task of the Church,"[2] a basis which would encompass both nature and task, as well as building on the Christological analogy.

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Commission on Faith and Order, Minutes of the Commission and Working Committee, Evanston and Chicago, Faith and Order Paper no. 21, (Lausanne: World Council of Churches, 1954), p. 18.

[2] Ibid., p. 19.

[3] "Unity," Reports of the Sections, The New Delhi Report, p. 117.

[4] World Council of Churches, Commission on Faith and Order, Minutes of the Working Committee, Faith and

(1) Church Unity and Human Unity

In the matter of ecclesiology, the Fourth World Conference at Montreal was an example of the truth enunciated at Amsterdam that no problem can be studied in isolation. Montreal brought to the churches the need for a hermeneutical principle, a need which became articulated

---

Order Paper no. 26, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1958), p. 10.

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] Willem A. Visser't Hooft, *No Other Name*, pp. 104-105.

XUM

after the Lund Conference when Christology was pursued through biblical studies as the question of the Church became the question of Christology. The problem of a plurality of ecclesiologies and church unity in the New Testament, the relationship of the Church and Resurrection, along with the increased participation of the Roman Catholic Church and the growing influence of those Orthodox Churches of Eastern Europe who entered the World Council at New Delhi all combined to increase the related and important questions pertaining to ecclesiology.

The approach of the North American Section of the theological commission of Christ and the Church was to study the question of the Church in the light of the "catholic" method, where reflection was made upon all of God's work from the beginning.[1] Still, they maintained the "relation of Christology to our understanding of the Church is implicit in the whole of our report,"[2] for "it is only by a cosmic victory that the Church exists at all."[3] The dimension of the ecclesiological question seemed, then, to reach its limit when the Commission's answer to the question of whether or not a study of the relation between Christ and the Church should include a treatment of a Christian understanding of the world was "a clear and definite 'yes'."[1] The Commission Report stated that, "the event of Jesus Christ established this lordship of God in a way new to the temporal and historical process,"[2] and the "action of God in Jesus Christ,...is directed to all humanity."[3] The study of the Church, then, must involve the study of mankind.

---

[1] "Introduction: Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," (North American Section), Faith and Order Findings, p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 19.

[3] Ibid., p. 13.

The methodology of the European Commission was also to study the Church in the light of Christ, especially since this method led to productive results in the study of baptism. The Commission believed that this methodology allowed the churches "to gain a perspective in which the hard realities of the churches appear less harsh and the fundamental elements of the doctrine of the Church assume a fresh aspect."[4] For "This union with Christ enthroned as King of the universe and Ruler of history gives the Church its teleology."[5]

The Montreal Report, building on these documents, revealed a concern to explore further the eschatological dimension of the Church, affirming the Church is "the 'new creation' precisely as the body of the crucified-risen Lord."[1] Recognizing that "the distinction and the relation between event and institution is not a denominational one,"[2] it stressed task over nature, even viewing the unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity as not only gifts but "also tasks."[3] The dynamic aspect was taking precedence over the static.

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] "Christ and His Church," Report of the North American Theological Commission, Faith and Order Findings, p. 23.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] "Foreword: Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," (European Section), ibid., p. 37.

[5] Ibid., p. 45.

(2) The Catholicity of the Church

Uppsala concerned itself with the catholicity of the churches, basing many of its reflections on the studies presented at Bristol in 1967. And the focus was on the task and challenge of renewal of the world with Christian activity as the agent through which God makes all things new.

In his opening remarks at Bristol, Dr. Vischer gave voice to some of the methodological critism which had been accruing for some time, especially since Montreal. He noted that the "Christological method" had guided Faith and Order work for a number of years, but then stated that, "The question is whether its presuppositions do not stand in need of re-examination, expansion and deepening."[1] Reflections on the differences in the New Testament were making this review a matter of urgency, and the confrontation of the churches with the modern world was driving the churches together.[2] Concern was expressed at Bristol about the "increasing influence of a 'theology of the secular', and a 'denigration of the importance of history,'"[3] concepts held by theologians for whom the Church does not occupy a central place in salvation history.

---

[1] "The Church in the Purpose of God," Report of Section One, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 42.

[2] Ibid., p. 45.

[3] Loc. cit.

The discussion of the paper on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church revealed the concern of some members that the world situation be more explicitly recognized and that the discussion of catholicity should not center around ecclesiology only, "but it should be made clear in what ways the Church's catholicity was to be realized anew to fulfill God's mission in the world."[4] The document, "God in Nature and History," was an attempt to bring about such a discussion. It was closely related to the study on the Church's catholicity and "extends our vision of catholicity so that we see it to include the whole

---

[1] "Opening Address by Lukas Viseher," New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 122.

[2] Ibid., p. 123.

[3] "Summary of address, 'The Future of Faith and Order Work,'" by John Meyendorff, ibid., p. 93.

[4] "Discussion of the Paper, 'The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church,'" ibid., p. 87.

XUM

world, in space and in time and to involve the unity of all men."[1] Uppsala mentioned this "second dimension of catholicity"[2] explicitly, recognizing that the Church's unity is conditioned by its contribution to the world's unity.

iv. Eschatology

Eschatology played a strong role in the deliberations at Uppsala where prominence was given to the Holy Spirit Who makes Christians more aware of the world's needs and summons them to the task of catholicity which reaches completion when God's plan, begun in history, is disclosed and fulfilled. Yet the intellectual efforts were primarily directed toward seeking solutions to the practical problems facing mankind. The question of the nature of the Church yielded to the more pressing concerns of the Church's unity and mission. The concerns are seen to be intimately bound up with other given unities, those of creation and mankind, unities which demand further explanation and understanding. In this way there is hope that the true meaning of Church will be revealed.

In confronting the disunity of the Church at Amsterdam, the delegates also had to confront the fact that

---

[1] "Discussion of the Paper, "God in Nature and History," Summary of Principal Marsh's remarks, *ibid*., p. 89.

[2] "Discussion of the Report on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church, *ibid*., p. 10.

XUM

there was no agreed Christian understanding or interpretation of the doctrine of the Church. Yet the history of the ecumenical movement reveals that there are wide areas of agreement among Christian churches, and, indeed, it is the God-given unity which already exists that makes the exploration of differences possible and necessary.

In an essay published in the Amsterdam Assembly Series, Gustaf Aulen said that, "No Messiah can exit without an ecclesia belonging to him."[1] But Jesus is Lord of all creation and the Church is the Body of the Risen Christ. Christians live in the old age and the new age. And it is this relationship of the Church to creation and to all mankind that is now under study. For the Messiah has promised to return and this return awaited by the ecclesia which belongs to him, has its part to play both in understanding the Church's unity and the Church's task. Jesus Christ has entered history and through Jesus and the Church mankind is related to God. The goal of salvation history is not technological progress or a just society, but the reign of God. Yet the Church must wage continual war against the forces of destruction while at the same time recognizing that the fulfilment that has already come is but a promise of what is to come when the reign of God shall be fully established. While realizing that "the view of the Church, living and fighting in this world, is an eschatological view,"[1] still Christians must be conscious that "to despair of any human realization of the Kingdom within the bounds of time and space has meant to relegate it to the transcendent dimension called heaven, of which the mortal mind can scarcely hold a conception."[2] Yet it is God's reign which is the central message of Jesus.

---

[1] Gustaf Aulen, "The Church in the Light of the New Testament," Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 19.

4. Summary

i. Question Facing Faith and Order

Of all the subjects on the agenda of Faith and Order since its founding, none has been more pervasive or so obviously in need of exploration as that of the Church itself. The quest of the Churches for the unity of the Church operates under the assumption that the Church exists and yet must be discovered. Both the doctrine and the nature of the Church as well as the task of the Church have been examined, comparatively as well as dialectically, in order to further the Church's search for unity. Theologians have begun the quest with a strong ecclesial perspective and their search has widened the context from Church unity to the unity of all mankind. At Amsterdam the Churches' "deepest difference" was between the 'catholic' and

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[2] J. Robert Nelson, "Toward an Ecumenical Ecclesiology," *Theological Studies*, December, 1970, p. 649.

'protestant' view of the Church.[1] At Lund, thanks to biblical theology and a new methodology, pursuit of a common Christology tended to eliminate some of the sharp distinctions in these two traditionally opposed views. The growing emphasis on Christian service turned thought increasingly towards the relationship between the Church and Society and towards the task of the Church in the world. Montreal responded to this emphasis by speaking of the "cosmic victory" of Christ by which the Church exists. Both God's work from the beginning and God's work at present in the world called for a Christian understanding of the world and the Church's relationship to it if the task was to take precedence over the Nature of the Church. The Church was seen as truly Catholic and its task then to be truly Catholic had to be seen as involving the unity of all mankind. Eschatology was also receiving increased attention. The deepest difference now appeared to be located in the relation of the Church to creation and to mankind, and to be articulated in relation to the influence and place of a theology of the secular and the Church's response to the world. The ecclesiological question facing Faith and Order now is "What is the function of the Church in relation to the unifying purpose of God for the world?"[2]

---

[1] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I, p. 204.

[2] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the

XUM

ii. Teilhard and Vatican II

Before attempting to consider Teilhard's view of the relationship of the Church to the unity of mankind it should first be noted that whenever Teilhard spoke of the Church he spoke from his pre-Vatican II Roman Catholic understanding of the Church, an understanding which identifies the Church with the Church of Rome. Teilhard was also influenced by a biological viewpoint which stressed the organic need for a head giving direction to the movement. He saw the Roman Catholic Church with its strong hierarchical structure and its visible head as embodying the necessary form that Christianity should have, a form that is cephalized.

Teilhard's view of Catholicism, however, was based on something more substantial than the presence of the Bishop of Rome as a sign and symbol of unity. For Teilhard the Church is catholic because it has a continuity with the past and a wholeness manifesting enough flexibility to lead to Christian humanism. Teilhard is more concerned with the universal Christological aspects of the Christian mystery and its effects, and less concerned with Church government. He simply sees the unity of Church government reflecting a universal biological structure.

It is the Church's rootedness in the past and its ceaseless development with Christ at its head that pronounces

---

Church," Report of Section One, New Directions in Faith and Order, Appendix III, p. 131.

XUM

it catholic for Teilhard. There is little doubt that the views of Teilhard yield easily, without losing anything of their cogency, to the changed view of Vatican II concerning the existence of Churches and other ecclesial realities. For Teilhard, Christ is the Alpha and Omega, the Head of the Church and the guarantor of its unity.

Yet Teilhard did insist on the need for a visible head of the body to give direction and guidance to it reflecting not only his own tradition but an organic perspective worthy of consideration. This need is presently under consideration in Faith and Order studies as, for example, in the studies on the place of Councils in the Ecumenical movement.[1] Lesslie Newbigin believes that the time is probably here "when it will be necessary to give much attention to two other elements in the total picture of church order--the conciliar and the papal."[2] It is his contention that "the forms of the Church's unity cannot be conceived without any reference to the forms of man's natural social life,"[3] a view certainly reflecting that of Teilhard.

---

[1] Councils and the Ecumenical Movement, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1968.

[2] Lesslie Newbigin, "Which Way For Faith and Order," What Unity Implies, p. 125.

[3] Ibid., pp. 126-127.

XUM

iii. Teilhard's Contribution

Teilhard, working from a framework that was both evolutionary and concerned with unification, addressed himself to the many aspects of the question of the Church and human unity frequently. He saw the world not yet finished, and the Church central and essential to its completion. The Church is the nucleus about which humanity forms. The perfection of men lies in their union with God. This union is effected through Christ. Christ is the center of the Church for the Church is His body. For Teilhard the function of the Church in relationship to the world's unity is fundamentally one which is _sine qua non_. Human unity, brought about by thought and personalization, cannot be brought to its perfection except by the motivating love of God effected through Christ in the Church. The Church, then, is the source of Christian love that will carry mankind to its term. It is the function of the Church to Christianize everything that is human. It was this focus that commanded Teilhard's attention, a focus oriented towards developing human beings to their fullest and bringing the world to its fulfilment and completion.

The Church is not extrinsic to human unity, but is at its very root. The essence of Christianity is

XUM

"the unification of the world in God by the Incarnation."[1] Such unity is a matter of faith, not science. It results from an "acceptance of an affirmation received from on high."[2] Nelson cautions that "there is a development of mankind according to Heilsgeschichte--but it is a moral struggle, not explainable in terms of a natural evolutionary process."[3] Teilhard would support this position unequivocally, but would add that mankind's development is not understandable without evolution, since God makes use of the evolutionary process to effect his will. Evolution is the expression of creation in time and space. It is the particular contribution of Teilhard to place Heilsgeschichte in this framework thereby establishing the Church in the center of mankind's search for unity. He gave emphasis to Christ's role in creation. Accepting the scotist position over the thomistic, and a view of the Body of Christ as organic, allowed him to explore the possibilities of the organic union of all with Christ. It allowed him to see Christ and the Church as central to the world's unification. It enabled him to accept the expanding dimensions of the universe never fearing that the place of Christ or the influence of Christ would necessarily be diminished. Christ is intrinsic to the world and moves it to its end. This view places the Church in the forefront of the struggle for development stressing that service belongs to the essence of the Gospel proclamation.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Sketch of a Personalistic Universe," in Human Energy, p. 91.

[2] Teilhard, "Outline of a Dialectic of Spirit," in Activation of Energy, p. 149.

[3] J. Robert Nelson, "Towards an Ecumenical Ecclesiology," Theological Studies, (December, 1970), p. 646.

In his view of the Church, Teilhard stressed the personal aspect as well as the cosmic. God is a personal being who is the goal of a personal union. For Teilhard "Christianity is eminently the religion of the imperishable and the personal."[1] Yet paralleling Faith and Order Studies in ecclesiology he explored a Christian universalism based on the centrality of Christ building on the Christological analogy. His reflections were "made upon all of God's work from the beginning"[2] and Christ's cosmic victory "directed to all humanity,"[3] stressing the task of the Church. His cosmic perspective and his faith in Christ's triumph, when taken in the light of his scotistic approach to the Incarnation and reparation, led him to minimize the moral struggle of mankind's development. The plan of the Church rests on the belief that in the Church "the

---

[1] Teilhard, "How I Believe," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 125.

[2] Introduction: "Report of The Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," (North American Section), Faith and Order Findings, p. 11.

[3] "Christ and His Church," Report of the North American Theological Commission, Faith and Order Findings, p. 23.

XUM

influence of the cosmic Christ is transmitted, chiefly through the Eucharist and Christian action."[1] Teilhard sees Christianity as a religion of earthly and temporal values. It unifies both the universal and the personal. But in stressing the universal, he runs the risk of neglecting the personal. The Church is not only the instrument of God's grace and the particular locus of his presence, it is also sinful and weary and in need of mercy. Man is not only engaged in struggling with nature but also is struggling with himself and his sinful tendencies. Teilhard recognized this but preferred to emphasize the positive side believing that this negative side suffered from overdevelopment. He was more concerned to consider the world as God's creation than as hostile to God.

Uppsala focused on the task and the challenge of the Church to renew the world. Teilhard believed that the catholicity of the world must be grasped through the Church. The Church holds the answer to the world's progress and its unity. It is Christianity that is open to the future and gives coherence to matter and to history.

The Church has a part to play in all secular realities. In Teilhard's view of the Church and the unity of mankind there is no identification of Gospel and secular although his cosmic christology tends to diminish the element of the discontinuous in the world. Nissiotis points out that "God's new initiative in Christ and man's inner aspirations must be seen as working together towards the same end, but must not be identified or confused."[1] In Teilhard's work they are not identified or confused. He focuses on Christ as the center of renewal, sees the Church as absolutely necessary and views the whole world as the object of redemption. Teilhard avoids the dangers of secularism while urging Christians to be totally involved in the world. In Hefner's view "he held the spirit of radical revision together with an unabashed and unmistakable Christian identity. His was not a 'secular' religion that seemed to be a warmed-over belief."[2] Teilhard's views reinforce the assumption that the Church must be the starting point for wordly unity, and it is Christ who will gather all to himself.

---

[1] Hefner, The Promise of Teilhard, p. 103.

---

[1] Nikos Nissiotis, "The Pneumatological Aspect of the Catholicity of the Church," in What Unity Implies, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1969, p. 22.

[2] Hefner, The Promise of Teilhard, p. 118.

CHAPTER VII

CHRIST IN MATTER

1. Teilhard: Christ in Matter

Teilhard as a scientist and an evolutionist was profoundly concerned with the material universe. He was also aware of the great advance of science in the 18th century and the enthusiasm and hopes born from this advance which often resulted, he thought, in a "religion of science" whose mysticism "strayed off into the worship of matter."[1] Many scientists were convinced that once the laws of matter yielded to the analysis of man, man would be able to perfect himself by his own power. The religion of science, Teilhard felt, led to "mechanical determinism" and a "somewhat illogical worship of self-sufficient, or even all-powerful man...."[2] The result of this perspective intensified the hostility between religion and science, since materialists often offered explanations unacceptable to believers, and believers very often condemned science as inimical to the revelation of the Gospels. His life-long task was to try to heal

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Mysticism of Science," in Human Energy, p. 172.

[2] Ibid., p. 173.

XUM

this breach and to reconcile science and religion. He did not believe that a Christian should negate the world, but rather transform it. For the Christian, "his religion, if true, can have no other effect than to perfect the humanity in him. And he believed, also, that for the Christian evolutionist "the barrier which appeared to separate the sacred from the profane can now be overcome."[1]

Teilhard attempted to overcome this barrier by spiritualizing evolution and analyzing the place of matter in God's creative plan. He set forth his belief early in his writings when he said "by assimilation to the Body of Christ, some part of matter is destined to pass into the foundations and walls of the heavenly Jerusalem,"[2] and this belief became his constant task to discover Christ in matter.

i. Christogenesis and Cosmogenesis

The relationship between Christ and the process of evolution had always been a key idea in Teilhard's system of thought. Christ, through his incarnation, his "Kenosis in matter,"[3] was not only immersed in matter but took charge of all creation. Teilhard saw Christ working through the evolutionary process to effect salvation. He saw no opposition between this truth of revelation and this scientific truth, but rather assimilation. He spoke of "Christianity and evolution--not two irreconcilable points of view, but two ways of looking at things that are designed to dovetail together, each completing the other."[1] If the Universal Christ is to appear at the end of time then this cannot happen without reference to evolution since Christ entered the developing universe "through the medium of birth."[2] This entrance and assimilation by the Incarnation has sanctified matter. It becomes "Christified." Teilhard says that "To Christify matter. There is the whole adventure of my life."[3] There is now a new relationship between Christ and the stuff of the universe. The material universe can no longer be despised by anyone in the name of Christianity, nor can matter in itself be set in opposition to spirit in any form of dialogue. The presence of God informs matter and extends to the utmost bounds of the cosmos.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 179.

[2] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in Writings in Time of War, p. 64.

[3] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 62.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Catholicism and Science," in Science and Christ, pp. 189-190.

[2] Teilhard, "Suggestions for a New Theology," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 181.

[3] Teilhard, La Coeur de la Matière, (1950, unpublished essay, Library of the American Teilhard de Chardin Society, New York City), n.p.

XUM

ii. Creation

In the preface to the Phenomenon of Man, Teilhard informs his readers that he is not trying to discover "a system of ontological and causal relations between the elements of the universe, but only an experimental law of recurrence which would express their successive appearance in time."[1] He assures his readers he is not precluding the speculation of theologians and philosophers, but his concern is with scientific speculation and reflection. As an aid to philosophers and theologians who would like to pursue such speculation, Teilhard points out in footnotes those critical junctures in the evolutionary process where he feels that such speculations could prove worthwhile, places where they should "for reasons of a higher order,...look for breaches of continuity."[2]

When Teilhard, in his analysis of man's genesis, arrives at the critical point of the emergence of thought, he relates carefully that he is confining himself to the phenomenon and marks this place as one where further investigation can be done by those who are competent. He states that at this point "there is nothing to prevent the thinker who adopts a spiritual explanation from positing, under the phenomenal veil of a revolutionary transformation, whatever 'creative' operation or 'special intervention' he likes."[1] So Teilhard does not prejudge here in a scientific explanation the mode of the creation of man by God's intervention. Later on when he speaks further of the first man, he says that scientifically viewed "the 'first man' is, and can only be, *a crowd*, and his infancy is made up of thousands and thousands of years."[2] It is for this reason that science cannot pronounce on monogenism. He explains in a footnote, however:

---

[1] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 29.

[2] Loc. cit.

> At those depths of time when hominisation took place, the presence and the movements of a unique couple are positively ungraspable, unrevealable to our eyes at no matter what magnification. Accordingly one can say that there is room *in this interval* for anything that a transexperimental source of knowledge might demand.[3]

And in the epilogue to this work, entitled The Christian Phenomenon, in speaking of the Omega Point, the point to which he believes all creation is converging, Teilhard says that it is his Christian faith which allows him to establish Christ in this central place. He says that

> ...the binding contact between God and the world, *hic et nunc* inchoate, attains to a super-intimacy (which is thus outside all logic) of which man can have no inkling and to which he can lay no claim by virtue of his 'nature' alone.[4]

The Christian phenomenon rises up at the very

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 169. Footnote One.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[3] *Loc. cit.*, Footnote One

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 298. Footnote One.

XUM

core of the social phenomenon effecting, as Julian Huxley says, "a threefold synthesis--of the material and physical world with the world of mind and spirit, of the past with the future; and of variety with unity, the many with the one."[1] Teilhard views all of knowable reality as a process. As he says, "Matter reveals...itself to us in a state of genesis or becoming...."[2] And the end of this process is intimately linked to Christ who controls the destiny of the created world and who will bring it to completion at the Pleroma, when the Christification of matter will have been completed. This process began at the Incarnation and will be perfected at the Second Coming.

iii. Incarnation

In his scientific view of matter, Teilhard discovered that "if things hold and hold together, it is only by reason of complexity, from above."[3] He sees each element of the cosmos as woven from all the others subsisting "from above through the influence of unities of a higher order which incorporate and dominate it for their own ends."[4] Through faith Teilhard identifies Christ with this unifying force directing things to their end, an end which, since the Incarnation, is identified with Christ. For Teilhard the meaning of cosmogenesis and therefore creation is to be found in Christogenesis. God has, through the Incarnation, unified the world, "By partially immersing himself in things, by becoming 'element', and then, from this point of vantage in the heart of matter, assuming the control and leadership of what we now call evolution."[1] It is through the Incarnation that God in Christ will gather mankind together and transform all. For Teilhard, this is an explication of Paul's thought that God shall be all in all. Through the Incarnation and the Christification of matter there results "a superior form of 'pantheism' without trace of the poison of adulteration or annihilation--the expectation of perfect unity, steeped in which each element will reach its consummation...."[2]

---

[1] Sir Julien Huxley, "Introduction," ibid., p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 49.

[3] Ibid., p. 43.

[4] Ibid., p. 44.

So in viewing Christ and the world of matter, Teilhard believes that the first act of the Incarnation was the plunging of the divine unity into the depths of the multiple. He believed that for Christ to make his entrance into the world by any other way except through matter would be incomprehensible. As he says, "The Redeemer could penetrate the stuff of the cosmos, could pour himself into the lifeblood of the universe, only by first dissolving himself in matter, later to be reborn

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 293-294.

[2] Ibid., p. 294.

XUM

from it."[1] Christ was "'innoculated' in matter" and the Incarnation was "the sign of Christ's definitely taking possession of the world."[2]

The evolution of the world toward the consummation in Christ is a theological understanding of evolution which, for Teilhard, expresses God's work in his continuous creation. Christ, by immersing himself in matter at the Incarnation and assuming the primacy of all created reality, made perfect God's plan of creation and salvation. All facets of this plan are interlocking. The Incarnation and the continuance of it through the Church as well as Christ's redemptive activity, in the thought of Teilhard, are integrally related to the mysteries of creation and the consummation of the world. For Teilhard the work of the spirit takes place in and through the transformation of matter. Christ immersed himself in matter in order to redeem it. Because of the Incarnation matter "contains the spur or the allurement to be our accomplice towards heightened being...."[3] The presence of God in all created reality produces the divine milieu, a milieu which is "at the antipodes of false pantheism"[4] and which allows

---

[1] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 60.

[2] Ibid., p. 61.

[3] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 83.

[4] Ibid., p. 94.

XUM

a person to be united with the divine while remaining himself. It is the thought of Teilhard that

> To the Christian, for whom the whole process of humanisation is merely a paving of the way for the Ultimate Parousia, it is above all Christ who invests Himself with the whole reality of the Universe; but at the same time it is the Universe which is illumined with all the warmth and immortality of Christ.[1]

iv. Christianity

Teilhard sees the work of the redeeming Incarnation continued in the Church, the Body of Christ. Christianity is catholic in its nature addressing itself to every man and to every class of men. It is both personalistic and universal, and Teilhard wants to ground it in the very substance of the world, rejecting a juridical approach which could make the Church extrinsic or alien in its relationship to the world. He says

> ...the City of God is too often described in pious works in conventional and purely moral terms. God and the world he governs are seen as a vast association, essentially legalistic in its nature, conceived in terms of a family or government...led astray by a false evangelism, people often think they are honouring Christianity when they reduce it to a sort of gentle philanthropism. Those who fail to see in it the most realistic and at the same time the most cosmic of beliefs and hopes, completely fail to understand its 'mysteries.'[2]

For Teilhard, the renewal of the cosmic outlook

---

[1] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis?," in The Future of Man, p. 224.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 293.

XUM

which he sees as characteristic of the modern mind, has brought about a crisis in all the traditional religions. But he believes that Christianity, because of its embrace of the material world and the goodness of creation, is showing signs of progress and confidence. It appears more necessary to the world than ever before as it is able to adjust to the newly-discovered dimensions of the universe. Through the Incarnation and Christ's bond with the material universe Christianity is able to discover God everywhere in the world. Teilhard says "the bigger the world becomes and the more organic becomes its internal connections, the more will the perspectives of the Incarnation triumph."[1] He believes that the evolutionary process offers man a means of feeling more in union with God. Because of this union with God Christianity can readily accept the concept of a world constantly being enlarged by scientific study. Not only has it nothing to fear from a world in evolutionary movement but this dynamic process can enlarge the horizons of Christianity and urge it to develop more fully and vigorously. As Teilhard sees it "Evolution has come to infuse new blood, so to speak, into the perspectives and aspirations of Christianity."[2] It is Christianity, rooted in the Incarnation and immersed in the world of matter, which is the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 296.

[2] Ibid., p. 297.

XUM

religion of the future. It is Christianity alone which "can bend our hearts not only to the service of that tremendous movement of the world which bears us along, but beyond, to embrace that movement in love."[1] For in the evolutive universe matter and spirit are seen as two integrated terms in one movement. Spirit cannot be saved without matter and it is Christianity which "maintains the value and rights of the flesh, which the Word assumed, and which he is going to raise to life again."[2] It is Christianity that can reconcile the one and the many, spirit and flesh, God and man. So it is imperative for the Church to reject anything that approaches Manicheism or excessive spiritualism. Christ "did not lessen, but consecrated the integrity of Mother Earth,"[3] and through the Christian Phenomenon he continually extends this consecration.

2. Teilhard and the Eucharist

For Teilhard, through matter, it is "God himself who rises up in the heart of this simplified world."[4] It is this activity of Christ working in and through matter

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 169.

[3] Teilhard, "My Universe," in Science and Christ, p. 60.

[4] Teilhard, Hymn of the Universe, p. 119.

XUM

which is the basis of both Incarnation and Eucharist. In both instances the Word becomes flesh and the flesh becomes the sacramental vehicle of the Word. Through the Incarnation and Resurrection Christ's Presence is extended throughout the universe. The redeeming work of Christ is carried out through the Church and is effected especially in the celebration of the Eucharist. Christ "through the magnetism of his love and the effective power of his Eucharist, gradually gathers into himself all the unitive energy scattered through his creation."[1] Teilhard believes that when the Eucharist is celebrated the individual reality of Christ is truly present, but this is but a particularisation of a unique and continuous activity, "the Incarnation, realised, in each individual, through the Eucharist."[2]

Teilhard, then, in his thought on Eucharistic presence goes beyond the localization and particularization of an individual Eucharistic celebration to its cosmic role in permeating the universe and redeeming the world. The Eucharist sanctifies matter and "step by step it irresistably invades the universe."[3]

It is in the whole of humanity that matter is transformed into spirit. In the Church, the consciously

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 102.

[3] Ibid., p. 104.

Christified part of humanity, through the Eucharist especially, individuals are united to Christ and redemption proceeds for all creation. The Eucharist is not only an act of Christ giving himself to men or for men, but it is also the response of men. As Teilhard says in the Divine Milieu:

> To the total offer that is made me, I can only answer by a total acceptance. I shall therefore react to the eucharistic contact with the entire effort of my life--of my life of today and of my life of tomorrow, of my personal life and of my life as linked to all other lives.[1]

That which begins as receiving culminates in total self-giving. The sacrifice of Christ for man makes possible the sacrifice of man to him.

This perception of God's presence throughout the universe cannot "be attained directly by any process of reasoning, nor by any human artifice."[2] It is completely gratuitous. The initiative comes from God and all progress is a "new response to a new gift."[3] Nothing on earth is profane for those who know how to see and it is faith that gives vision; Faith in the resurrection of Jesus and his Lordship of faith in His presence in the Eucharist and faith in his coming again in glory.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 105.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Loc. cit.

i. Real Presence and the Body of Christ

In adhering to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church Teilhard accepted the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He accepted also the concept of transubstantiation by which this presence was explained. He was concerned, however, with a much wider presence of Christ in the universe and this presence occupied much of his attention. This wider presence was predicated on a real Eucharistic presence and it was the eucharistic mystery which would extend the presence of Christ and bring about what he termed "a truly universal 'transubstantiation',"[1] a world transformed and redeemed. For Teilhard, the influence of the universal Christ is effected through the Eucharist, but by the Eucharist understood, once again, in its universal power and realism.[2]

As distinct from the particular localized place given to the Eucharist, Teilhard wants to explore the fundamental place the Eucharist has in the economy of the world and to do this he believes it necessary to consider the extensions of Christ's real presence. He states that primarily the bread is "the fragment of matter to which, through transubstantiation, the Presence of the Incarnate Word attaches itself among us, that is to say in the human zone of the universe."[1] In constructing an analogy, Teilhard says that just as an individual identifies his body as the center of his spiritual radiation, so can the Christian identify the eucharistic elements as the Primary Body of Christ. But he maintains that Christ does not remain contained in this primary Body but mystically assimilates all that surrounds him. He gradually redeems the world. As he says somewhat poetically, "The world is the final, and the real, Host into which Christ gradually descends, until his time is fulfilled."[2] The Eucharist prolongs the redeeming activity of Christ. Through the presence of Christ in the Eucharistic celebration the universe is Christified. It is this Christification of matter, the restoration of all things in Christ which commanded Teilhard's attention. The progressive presence of Christ in the world and the role of the eucharist in this process was of more importance to him than an examination of the modality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. This cosmic dimension overshadowed the individual dimension. For Teilhard, humanity assimilates the world of matter and the Eucharist, the Body of Christ, assimilates humanity. There is a real change in the Eucharistic elements, but there is also a real change as the presence of Christ is extended throughout the world.

---

[1] Teilhard, *Le Christique*, p. 10.

[2] Teilhard, "My Universe," in *Science and Christ*, p. 64.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 65.

[2] _Loc_. _cit_.

XUM

As Mooney's study of Teilhard reveals, in the writings of Teilhard on the presence of Christ, there is a progression in the use of the word 'physical' with Christ's universal eucharistic presence, and in *The Divine Milieu* Teilhard effected a synthesis of these two concepts. Teilhard had always accepted an organic concept of the Body of Christ, rejecting either a metaphorical interpretation of the concept or a juridical explanation. Teilhard sees the Body of Christ as the physical center of mankind and the material universe not in the primary sense of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, but in the secondary sense of centration, uniting all to Himself. Christ, through the Eucharist, can unite himself to all the faithful. Christ becomes physically a universal element, a milieu as well as a center who through the extension of his eucharistic presence controls the whole movement of the universe. The purpose of this control is the construction of the new earth. In the two essays written on the Eucharist after the publication of *The Divine Milieu* in which Teilhard links the Eucharist with Christogenesis, he situates the Eucharist in the very heart of the process to build the earth and develops more fully the thought expressed in an earlier essay that "to receive the body of Christ is not simply to obey and merit a reward--it is organically to build up, element by element, the living

XUM

unity of the pleroma in Christ."[1]

ii. Extensions

Teilhard does not treat in his writings the mode of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He takes this real presence for granted. He does not give specific consideration to the Mass as a sacrifice or to the relationship between the Mass and the sacrifice of the Cross. Working within the framework of a dynamic evolutionary movement he was more concerned with the presence of Christ in the universe, and turned his attention to the consequence of the Eucharist which he considered as prolongations or extensions.

One of the earliest indications of this concern for the extension of the Eucharist is found in an essay written while Teilhard was in the front lines during the First World War. Because of a lack of supplies there he was unable to celebrate Mass and so he composed an essay which contained the seeds of his idea of the relation between the Eucharistic Christ and the world, and which in the judgment of Wildiers are not only theologically accurate but "make an equally exact distinction between the essential mystery and the further effects in which its fecundity is manifested--the growth of Christ's

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Humanity of Christ and the Faithful," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 19.

XUM

mystical body, the consecration of the cosmos."[1] Teilhard begins the essay by saying that since there is no bread or wine or altar, "I shall spread my hands over the whole universe and take its immensity" as the matter of the Eucharistic sacrifice.[2] He sees the whole world exalted awaiting union with God, yet "pulled up short by an impassable barrier. Nothing can attain Christ except he take it and enfold it."[3] He sees Jesus as the "*plenitude Entis creati*, the fulness of created being" and the "*plenitude Entis mei*"[4] the fulness of his own personal being. And he states the task which will occupy his thinking, and in which the Eucharist will play a central role, to disclose "the bonds of continuity that make the cosmos of our restless ferment into an ambience that is divinized by the Incarnation, that divinizes by communion, and that is divinizable by our cooperation."[5]

While on a scientific expedition in the Ordos desert five years after the war Teilhard again found himself without the means to celebrate Mass and used this opportunity to clarify further the extension of the

---

[1] N. M. Wildiers, Introduction to "The Mass on the World," in *Hymn of the Universe*, p. 15.

[2] Teilhard, "The Priest," in *Writings in Time of War*, p. 205.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 206.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 211.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 219.

Incarnation and the transformation of the world. It was the feast of the Transfiguration and this prompted him to reflect on the Eucharistic presence of Christ and its relationship to the world. He sees the world consecrated through the Incarnation and speaks of "the sacrament of the world,"[1] because all creation is made holy through the presence of Christ. He sees the consecration and transformation of the world brought about by the Eucharist as the influence of Christ is diffused in the depths of matter, and he feels constrained both as a Christian and a scientist to explore Christ in the world of matter. He says

> ...dominated as I am by a vocation which springs from the inmost fibres of my being, I have no desire, I have no ability, to proclaim anything except the innumerable prolongations of your incarnate Being in the world of matter: I can preach only the mystery of your flesh, you the Soul shining forth through all that surrounds us.[2]

For Teilhard, the cosmic consecration is a task to be accomplished and the perfect consecration will come only as the final end goal. It is Christ who will consecrate the world and bring it to its final goal in the Pleroma. The Eucharistic celebration holds a central place in this process. It reveals the consecration that has been consummated in Christ who is present and who has overcome the world. It remains the faith and hope of Christians to cooperate in building the Kingdom of God. The Eucharist is the pledge and the gift that enables Christians to carry out the tasks remaining and to cooperate in the consecration of mankind and the world. The Eucharist as envisioned by Teilhard is "the point of insertion where the word of God sanctifies the material world,"[1] and de Lubac points out that "In the Eucharist, which is the central mystery, Pere Teilhard contemplates both the extension of the Incarnation of the Word and the promise of the world's transfiguration."[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Mass on the World," in Hymn of the Universe, p. 26.

[2] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

iii. Centrality

The presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the consummation of the pleroma are brought together by Teilhard to explore how the cosmos is "divinizable by our co-operation."[3] Just as there is a new relationship between Christ and the material universe through Christ's immersion into matter, so must there be a relationship between the Eucharist and the material world. Christ has plunged himself into the evolutionary process and his

---

[1] Piet Smulders, The Design of Teilhard de Chardin, trans. by Arthur Gibson (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1967), p. 256.

[2] Lubac, The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 75.

[3] Teilhard, "The Priest," in Writings in Time of War, p. 219.

XUM

second coming therefore must have reference to the term of this process. Cosmogenesis becomes identified with Christogenesis as Christ directs the world to its consummation. And the Eucharist, then, becomes identified with Christogenesis, as Teilhard points out in The Divine Milieu, and with the Pleroma.

> Across the immensity of time and the disconcerting multiplicity of individuals, one single operation is taking place: the annexation to Christ of His chosen; one single thing is being made: the Mystical Body of Christ, starting from all the sketchy spiritual powers scattered throughout the world. Hoc est Corpus Meum...But it is also true that our salvation is not pursued or achieved except in solidarity with the justification of the whole 'body of the elect'...the divine milieu which will ultimately be one in the Pleroma, must begin to become one during the earthly phase of our existence.[1]

The Divine Milieu reveals that Teilhard has integrated the Eucharist into his theological world view, a view focused on a cosmic plane and one in which the Eucharist assumes a central place. In his next essay on the Eucharist, some twenty years later, Teilhard says that the Eucharist "is the first of the sacraments, or rather it is the one sacrament to which all the others are related."[2] To be united with Christ is to incorporate oneself into the process of Christogenesis and through the Eucharist this incorporation is deepened. Christ has assumed the headship of creation and because of his real presence in the Eucharist Teilhard can say that "the axis of the Incarnation, that is to say of creation, runs directly through the Eucharist."[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 124.

[2] Teilhard, "Introduction to the Christian Life," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 165.

For Teilhard the coherence of the world is possible only in Christ, and incorporation into the Body of Christ is made more profound through the Eucharist. The Body of Christ and the Eucharist is the presence throughout all time of the total mystery of redemption which is the continuation of the redemptive and unifying activity of Christ; through his Eucharistic theology Teilhard can explore the importance of human activity, and the role of that activity as an extension of God's creative work. Christ, through the Eucharist, "acquires and develops fully, a true omnipresence of transformation."[2] This transformation of the world is directed to the unity of all things in Christ. The influence of Christ on human activity and on the world can be seen in effecting the fulness of the Pleroma.

3. Faith and Order: Creation

In declaring the Church's message to the world, the early architects of the Faith and Order Movement were clear in their affirmation that this message is and must

---

[1] Ibid., p. 166.

[2] Teilhard, Le Christique, p. 10.

XUM

remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This Gospel is first of all, "the joyful message of redemption,"[1] and "the gift of God to sinful man."[2] Most of the report of Section Two was concerned with speaking of the call to repentance, the forgiveness of sins, and the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God through Christ. But the delegates also recognized that, "the world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's spirit in all humanity,"[3] and that the Church in the Gospel, "meets the needs and fulfills the God-given aspirations of the modern world."[4]

While Faith and Order in its early years concentrated on the more internal aspects of ecclesiology, comparing beliefs and appraising doctrinal expressions, today this question of the world's aspirations occupies a central position in Faith and Order study, especially in regard to the activity of the Holy Spirit in all creation, and the task of the Church in the modern world. These areas, presently under study by theologians of Faith and Order, cut sharply across confessional lines and so can be studied by the churches together.

---

[1] "The Church's Message to the World: the Gospel," Report of Section Two, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 461.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., pp. 461-462.

[4] Ibid., p. 463.

The approach, too, to be used in this search for unity, reveals a perennial difference in methodology. In the discussion of Section II of Lausanne, the observation was made that, "If we look out on the needs of the entire world, and then look up to God in the blazing sun of His all-inclusive love, reaching out to His entire creation, our differences will dwindle into insignificance."[1] While this is certainly an optimistic view of overcoming differences on the way to unity, it reflects a methodology currently offered as an approach to restore unity.[2] The Report of the North American Section of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church also reflects this question of methodology. It asked specifically, "Does a proper method demand that the study proceed in the sequence Christ-World-Church rather than in the progressive Christ-Church-World?"[3] and announced that both orders were used in the Report.

When the Edinburgh Conference looked at the world it saw a society rapidly changing, a society in which established institutions and customs, in morality and religion as well as economics and politics, were disintegrating. But there was the recognition, also, that, "The modern world, and especially the younger part of it, wants community,"[1] and that, "there is in man an inborn longing for community."[2] It saw a divided Church, "totally unable to offer more than a caricature of the Gospel."[3] So the unity of the Church and the longing of men for community could not be separated.

---

[1] "Discussion of 'The Church's Message to the World: the Gospel,'" Remarks of Rev. Dr. Timothy Ting-Fang Lew, *ibid.*, p. 104.

[2] Cf., "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," *New Directions in Faith and Order*, pp. 133-140. The document, "God in Nature and History," took history, and primarily salvation history as its starting point.

[3] "Introduction: Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," *Faith and Order Findings*, p. 13.

The delegates at Lund, viewing the disunity of the churches and the divisions among men intensified by the war saw at the root of ecclesial differences, "a false antithesis between the Church's being in Christ and its mission in the world,"[4] and recommended that ecclesiology be studied in close relation to Christology and pneumatology.[5] Faith and Order continued to proclaim the unity of the Church, a unity having its reality in Christ Himself, but increasing recognition was being given to God's work and purpose in creation. God is the creator of the world and its sustainer as he moves and acts in history. Creation and redemption are inseparably linked. And Faith and Order felt obliged to consider extending its ecclesiological study in this direction. New Delhi spoke of witness as "testimony to the whole activity of God in the creation and preservation of the world,"[1] although witness consists "especially in his mighty acts in Israel's history and in the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ."[2]

---

[1] "The Conference Looks at the World," Chapter Three, Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 48.

[2] Ibid., p. 43.

[3] Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[4] "Christ and His Church," The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 18.

[5] Ibid., p. 22.

i. One World

In a word to the churches the officers of the Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order said the "Lord of all the world is at work...shaping a world which cannot deny that it is one world..,"[3] reflecting both the Christological basis of Faith and Order work especially since Lund, and the concern for widening the scope of unity, since "a sound ecclesiology must be related to Christian understanding of creation."[4] This concern is evident also in the section on Worship, where it is stated that, "Christian worship is the act by which the Church recognizes its identification with the whole creation and offers it to God in service."[1]

---

[1] "Witness," Reports of the Sections, The New Delhi Report, p. 79.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] "A Word to the Churches," The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 39.

[4] "Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," (North American Section), Faith and Order Findings, p. 13.

Montreal, not unexpectedly, presented an "embarras de richesses"[2] in the way of proposals demanding further study, one of which was that "The whole question of the proper relation of creation and redemption needs much further study in Faith and Order."[3] The Section was not able to arrive at any clear resolution as to how Christ's Lordship over the world should be described, whether it can be identified only through the activity of the Church or is it exercised apart from it. There was agreement that in both the world of man outside the Church and in non-human creation God's grace was present, but there was no agreement as to "whether or not these are redemptive works of God, or whether or not they should be called works of Christ as marks of his Lordship."[4]

At Aarhus, the members of the Faith and Order Commission supported the Montreal resolution to study creation and redemption, not for the sake of a general theological discussion but "precisely for the sake of

---

[1] "Worship and the Oneness of Christ's Church," Report of Section Four, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 71.

[2] David M. Paton, "A Montreal Diary," ibid., p. 15.

[3] "The Church in the Purpose of God," Report of Section One, ibid., p. 43.

[4] Loc. cit.

XUM

church unity."[1] The context of the mission of the Church is now a highly technological society, and the essentials of Christian faith are challenged radically by new visions of the universe and man. The realities of human history, God's creation and His purpose are receiving increased attention in World Council Studies. Recognizing, as did Teilhard, that under evolution, "the life of nature has more and more been drawn into the life of history,[2] and that the "enormous expansion of the phenomenology of the world-as-nature confronts Christianity with a clamant task,"[3] the Commission authorized the study, "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church."

In 1962, the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches authorized a world-wide conference on Church and Society to "look at the problems of society in the modern world from the perspective of God's call to man"[4] in order to assist the development of theological insights for the churches to be more effective witnesses in the world. The conference examined the impact of technology on society, the liberation of peoples, rich and poor nations, revolutionary change and Christian discipleship and other

---

[1] "Faith and Order: the Next Phase," Minutes of the Meetings, Aarhus, p. 12.

[2] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," *ibid*., p. 43.

[3] *Loc. cit*.

[4] Minutes of the Central Committee, Paris, p. 141.

XUM

issues relating to man and his world. A conference working group was established to prepare a report on the action of the Church in society. In discussing the theological issues in social ethics, this working group pointed out that both biblical revelation and modern science look to nature as "a process, as something which is a continuum or developing, and not as an event, given once and for all."[1] So man must rethink the relationship between nature and history. And since man is the crown of creation and gives meaning to nature, "the comprehension of nature is theologically anthropocentric."[2] Nature is redeemed in that "the Redeemer acts to bring creation into its still hidden destiny, the new creation."[3] And "The proclamation of redemption affects science...in that faith gives it direction."[4]

It is this conjunction of faith and science that Teilhard's work can be important for Faith and Order theologians. Faith and science, Teilhard believed, are but two facets of a single act of knowledge and purpose, and his life's work was to discover the "liberating harmony" between them, and reveal their unity. It was precisely this effort attempting to avoid the Scylla of separation and the Charybdis of concordism that raises the most acute problems for Teilhard's theologizing and gives it its originality and vitality.

---

[1] "Reports of the Working Groups," World Conference on Church and Society, Geneva, 1966, (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1967), p. 197.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 198.

[4] Loc. cit.

ii. Heilsgeschichte

The report given to the Faith and Order Commission at Bristol, in seeking a new and better relationship between the Gospel message and the modern world, took Heilsgeschichte as its starting point. It viewed creation as "the beginning of a chain in which nature, history and consummation are inseparable links."[1] It is only from God's activity in history, known through revelation, that one can see this connecting link. So it is possible, then, to look back to creation and forward to consummation. The opening act of history is the creation of nature. Biblical revelation tells us of the covenant between God and Man in history, and reveals God's purpose from the beginning. The Report states that, "the crucified and risen Jesus of Nazareth is the key to the understanding of the meaning of the whole created world."[2] Since creation leads to consummation, then "To take seriously the final events in Christ, must also mean that he is confessed as the ultimate secret of creation."[1] Creation cannot be separated from redemption. And therefore consummation exceeds creation.

---

[1] "God in Nature and History," New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 12.

The discussion of this paper revealed that there were strong differences in regard to its approach to creation. Criticism was voiced that the category of creation was not defined adequately.[2] And the paper presented by the English-Scandinavian study group wanted a starting point further back than biblical history in order to speak to those who are not Christians. In their report this group stated that for modern, scientific, technological man "creation has become...simply the indifferent and impersonal world"[3] in which he finds himself hopelessly lost. For them, "the stuff of man's life is not neutral but created."[4] There is a givenness in the very structure of life itself and in the relation of the ethical demand to it. Life contains certain possibilities or spontaneities. The awareness of value is given in the phenomena themselves and is not imposed externally. The same report also states that this doctrine of creation has been neglected when considering the Church and its work and issues the warning that, "if creation is ignored, then everyday life has nothing to do with God,"[1] and, "if the doctrine of creation is ignored and the starting point is taken to be Christ, it is superfluous to speak of 'new' creation, since the new creation in Christ is the only creation."[2] And the report draws the conclusion that, "the new creation in Christ is not to be simply equated with the Church."[3]

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] "Discussion of the Paper, 'God in Nature and History,'" *ibid.*, p.91.

[3] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," *ibid.*, p. 133.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

The reality of evil is stressed and there is a call for a stronger recognition that the re-creation of the world's unity must be seen in terms of reconciliation of men to God. So the orientation in this report in regard to sin, creation and re-creation differs from that of the report, "God in Nature and History." This report stressed the continual development of God's redemptive activity in history from creation to the Second Coming, and looked to revelation as the source of this knowledge.

Uppsala concerned itself with the needs and aspirations of a world more and more tied together through technology, and pointed out that, "the Word of God testifies to the unity of creation and to the unity of all men in Christ,"[4] for Jesus is the New Man in whose resurrection "a new creation was born, and the final goal of history

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 136-137.

[2] Ibid., p. 138.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] "Towards Justice and Peace in International Affairs," The Uppsala Report, Section Four, p. 61.

XUM

was assured."[1]

4. Faith and Order: The Eucharist

In discussing the sacraments of the Church, the delegates at Lausanne were convinced that the purpose of the Conference would best be served by avoiding a detached consideration of them, and attempting to show that there could be a common approach and a common appreciation of the sacraments among the churches.[2] They agreed that sacraments are constituted by an outward sign and an inward grace and that the sacraments are means of grace. The Report also took note of the fact that the Orthodox Church holds seven sacraments while others hold only two; Baptism and Eucharist. The Conference stressed only these two because these were generally acknowledged by the members of the Conference.

In commenting on the Eucharist, the delegates touched upon aspects of Eucharistic theology whose conception and interpretation are still highly disputed points among the churches today. There was agreement that the Eucharist is "the Church's most sacred act of worship,"[3] commemorating and proclaiming "the Lord's atoning death."[1] It is a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,"[2] as well as an "act of solemn self-oblation,"[3] and the delegates began their statement by saying that "We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present."[4] Yet these significant agreements were profoundly mitigated by the divergent views on the manner and the mode of the Lord's presence, the notion of sacrifice, the relation of the Eucharistic elements to the grace which the sacrament conveys, and the valid administration of the Eucharist relating to proper form, matter and minister.

---

[1] "Renewal in Mission," Section Two, ibid., p. 28.

[2] "The Sacraments," Report of Section Six, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 472.

[3] Ibid., p. 473.

The delegates closed their statement on the sacraments with "the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed,"[5] agreeing, undoubtedly, with the sentiments expressed by one of the delegates, that so long as the Lord's Table remains the symbol of division, "just so long must fellowship still be incomplete, most love remain imperfect, and the results which should proceed from the unity of the Head be unattained."[6] Forty years later, at Uppsala, the prayer expressed by the Lausanne delegates was still unrealized as the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order had to admit that "Intercommunion is an old but still acute ecumenical problem."[1]

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Loc. cit.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] Loc. cit.

[6] Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze, "The Necessity of Christian Unity for Christian Fellowship and Co-operation," ibid., p. 478.

The members of the Edinburgh Conference stated that, "We regard sacramental intercommunion as a necessary part of any satisfactory Church unity,"[2] yet had to acknowledge that "Intercommunion has not been widely extended during the decade."[3] While not all would agree with the Orthodox position that intercommunion "must be considered as the crowning act of a real and true reunion which has already been fully achieved by fundamental agreement in the realm of Faith and Order,"[4] nonetheless it seemed clear that the divergent conceptions and interpretations of the Lord's Supper was responsible for hindering intercommunion and that there was a need to examine Eucharistic theology as a means of making progress in this area.

The Section on the Eucharist given in Chapter V of the Edinburgh Report made some advance over the Lausanne Report, reflecting strongly the memorandum prepared for the

---

[1] "Report of the Assembly Committee on Faith and Order," The Uppsala Report, p. 224.

[2] "The Church's Unity in Life and Worship," Chapter Six, The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, p. 251.

[3] "Introduction to the Report," Chapter One, ibid., p. 222.

[4] "The Second Revision of the Report," ibid., p. 156.

XUM

Conference by Bishop Hicks of Lincoln on Eucharistic sacrifice. The Report mentioned that the use of bread and wine, the words of institution and prayer are important along with "agreement as to its essential and spiritual meaning,"[1] affirming that "Christ is truly present in the Eucharist" but shying away from any statement on the mode of his presence since attempts at defining this presence has been the cause of division in the past. The notion of sacrifice was extended to include not only the Lord's death but the obedience of his ministry on earth, and His resurrection and ascension and the belief that "Such a sacrifice ean never be repeated,"[2] but it is proclaimed in the Eucharistic action of the whole Church. The Report stated also that "the presence, which we do not try to define, is a spiritual presence,"[3] beginning from the historical fact of the Incarnation and moving to the Second Coming of the Lord and the reign of God.

The Report also included the Orthodox statement that the offered gifts are changed into the "very Body and the very Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,"[4] and distributed to the faithful for the remission of their sins and for eternal life.

---

[1] "The Church of Christ: Ministry and Sacraments," Chapter Five, ibid., p. 244.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 245.

[4] Ibid., p. 245. Footnote One.

i. Corporate Nature

The Continuation of theological discussion about the Eucharist was assured after Edinburgh as Commissions were established on Ways of Worship and Intercommunion. The war years intervened to hinder the work of these Committees, but in the autumn of 1950, after the formation of the World Council of Churches, their reports were sent out to the participating churches in preparation for the Lund Conference.

In speaking of current developments on worship, the Report of the Commission took note that there was an emerging liturgical movement observable in the churches of the World Council and a "growing sense that worship is not to be thought of as a gathering of individual pious Christians, but as a corporate act in direct relation to the Lord of the Church."[1] It further noted that "The mode of the Real Presence of Christ in eucharistic worship is the main question in debate in those churches which are striving for a liturgical reformation,"[2] recognizing the reaction to the perennial error which sets the spiritual and material in opposition to one another. There was a

---

[1] "Report of the Commission," in Ways of Worship, ed. by Pehr Edwall, Eric Hayman, and William D. Maxwell, (London: S.C.M., 1951), p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 29.

XUM

feeling that worship should have a central place in life and it was the rediscovery of the sacramental character of worship and its corporate nature that led to a focus on a Eucharist centered worship. There was still the problem of the priority of Word of Sacrament among the churches, but one could not admit that the opposition of Word to Sacrament is biblical. And the Report was sensitive to an idealist conception of the Word which "endangers not only the whole conception of sacraments but such essential Christian doctrines as creation and the Incarnation."[1]

The sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist was by no means a closed question, being re-opened through New Testament and patristic studies as Bishop Hicks pointed out at Edinburgh. The Commission called it a "live issue"[2] and a point which Lund would have to consider when discussing doctrinal differences.

The eschatological aspect of the Eucharist was also considered in the Commission Report and it was optimistically stated that "here there is less ground for disagreement,"[3] but did not elaborate on this statement. In the volume, Intercommunion, however, T. F. Torrance examines the eschatological dimension of the Eucharist and notes the rapprochement between the Catholic and Reformed traditions

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

[2] Ibid., p. 34.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

in both the sacrificial and eschatological dimensions of the Eucharist,[1] thanks to a renewed understanding of biblical teaching and a rediscovery of the eschatological nature of the sacraments. It was the eschatological and corporate nature of the Eucharist which began to receive more attention in Faith and Order Studies. These are the dimensions with which Teilhard concerned himself almost exclusively.

The delegates at Lund recorded in thankfulness that they had reached "a measure of understanding, which none of us would ever have anticipated, on the problem of the sacrificial element in Holy Communion,"[2] an understanding which included the perfect and sufficient sacrifice on Calvary, and the once and for all atonement for the world's sin. They said, however, that the most serious difficulties arise when they seek to express how "worship on earth is related to the intercession of Christ in heaven,"[3] some believing that they offer only a sacrifice of praise, service and thanksgiving, others believing that Jesus commits the offering made by the Church with His own sacrifice and takes this adoration up "into the Sanctus of the company of heaven."[1] The hope was raised in the Report that a study of biblical eschatology might help to resolve the problem.

---

[1] T. F. Torrance, "Eschatology and the Eucharist," in Intercommunion, ed. by Donald Baillie and John Marsh (London: S.C.M., 1952), pp. 303-350.

[2] "Ways of Worship," Section Four, The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 42.

[3] Loc. cit.

The burden of Lund's discussion of the Eucharist centered around this sacrificial aspect, but there were those who felt that this was not a wise course to follow since they thought that "the main issue is the real bodily presence of the crucified and risen Lord and our receiving of His body and blood."[2] However, it was the recommendation of the Report that there be a thorough examination of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ and man's response in worship and in life.[3]

ii. Eucharist and Ecclesiology

The Report on Unity given at the New Delhi assembly revealing a growing impatience at the painful division at the Lord's Table and urged that the churches "undertake a new examination of their eucharistic doctrines and liturgies..."[4] in order to break through the persistent impasse on the question of intercommunion and so witness more fully to the unity of the Church. Lund had endorsed a study of the Church and its unity in the light of the saving work of God in Christ and this focus, with its dialectical methodology, had proved fruitful. It was with hope, then, that a recommendation was made "that the Faith and Order Commission should institute an extended study of eucharistic theology, especially in view of recent developments in ecclesiology."[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 43.

[2] *Loc*. *cit*.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 47.

[4] "Unity," Reports of the Sections, *The New Delhi Report*, p. 128.

In discussing the relationship of Christ, the Church and the churches, the Montreal Report stated that the Church's unity is found, "even more profoundly in the koinonia of true eucharistic worship, where the whole Catholic Church is manifested."[2] Montreal recognized that there were still many disagreements about Holy Communion, and repeated the assertion that the Eucharist "is a sacrament of the presence of the crucified and glorious Christ until he comes,"[3] and a means by which his sacrificial death is operative in the Church. The cosmic element in Christian worship is given recognition, also, as "the act by which the Church recognizes its identification with the whole creation and offers it to God in

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Minutes of the Commission and Working Committee, Montreal, 1963. Paper no. 41, (Lausanne: World Council of Churches, 1963), p. 27.

[2] "The Church in the Purpose of God," Report of Section One, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 46.

[3] "Worship and the Oneness of the Christ's Church,"

XUM

service...it is an act in which...all things are made new."[1] Influenced by the Greek Fathers, Teilhard would identify this act as the process by which Christ gathers to Himself the grace scattered throughout creation manifesting the universal power and realism of the Eucharist.

iii. Bristol and Catholicity

Following the suggestion made at Montreal, the Faith and Order Commission endorsed an outline of study concerned with the Eucharist and its relation to the unity and disunity of the Church, setting it within the context of the worshipping life of the Church. The study was to be far-ranging, exploring the ancient liturgies, the impact of the Reformation on eucharistic faith, the sacramental aspects of the Eucharist such as Presence, Sacrifice and the activity of the Spirit. It was also to consider the meaning of the consecration, the eschatological dimension of the eucharist, the relation of eucharist and Church, eucharist and Word, and eucharist and unity. And it was recommended that a single report should be produced when the study was concluded.[2]

The Commission on Faith and Order was requested to present a report to the meeting to be held at Bristol

---

Report of Section Four, ibid., p. 73.

[1] Ibid., p. 71.

[2] Minutes of the Meetings, Aarhus, pp. 54-57.

XUM

and this report concentrated on three aspects of the Eucharist: Anamnesis and Epiclesis, Catholicity of the Eucharist, and the Eucharist and Agape.[1] In preparation the Secretariat had requested Professor von Allmen to do a study on the Eucharist as it relates to the ecumenical movement. He concluded that the first task facing the churches is "for each of them to rediscover for herself the meaning of the Eucharist and to give it the place which belongs to it,"[2] for only if the Eucharist is allowed to recover its wholeness will it become the motive and the factor for unity. He stressed also that the Eucharist event must be clearly distinguished from the Eucharistic theology. Its virtue is derived from its institution by Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Vischer called for more penetrating historical investigations of Eucharistic theology and practice, believing that the study of history can free the churches from irrefutably fixed positions. Yet, he states, "The look into the past is always at the same time the look into the future,"[3] and so, "Emphasis on the eschatological direction is of great importance for the ecumenical

---

[1] "The Holy Eucharist," New Directions in Faith and Order, pp. 60-68.

[2] Jean-Jacques von Allmen, The Lord's Supper, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1969), p. 114.

[3] Lukas Vischer, "Questions on the Eucharist, its past and future celebration," Studia Liturgica, Vol. V, no. 2 (Summer, 1966), p. 67.

XUM

movement."[1] The Consultation at Grandchamp also stressed the manifestation of fellowship in the local church, seeing the "Eucharist as the act of the local church and as the act of the catholic church."[2]

The Theological Commission formed at the request of the Commission at Aarhus presented its report to the Commission at Bristol. This report stated that Christ instituted the Eucharist "as the anamnesis of the whole of God's reconciling action in him,"[3] and that Christ Himself, with all that He had done for man and for all creation "is present in this anamnesis as is also the foretaste of his Parousia and the fulfilment of the Kingdom."[4]

In the section on the Catholic Character of the Eucharist, the Report declares that a Eucharist celebrated by a local assembly has "the fulness of catholicity."[5] This fulness of catholicity must keep in mind the wholeness of the Church, and its dimension is more than particular; it is cosmic. "The catholic character of the Eucharist is further seen in that it is in every place both an assurance

---

[1] Ibid., p. 78.

[2] "Notes and Comments," ibid., p. 124.

[3] "The Holy Eucharist," New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 61.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] Ibid., p. 62.

XUM

of redemption and a sign of hope to the whole cosmos."[1] The Eucharist reveals to the world what it must become,"[2] for the believers are united to the Person of Christ and to his intercession, and are "transfigured and accepted."[3] The Eucharist, then, is a "radical challenge to the 'demonic' tendencies in church life toward estrangement, separation and fragmentation."[4]

This Report on the catholic character of the Eucharist represented "an advance toward an ecumenical theology of the Eucharist."[5] But not claiming to be a general theology of the Eucharist, it was recommended "that the study of the Eucharist be continued and broadened, with particular attention to the fullness of eucharistic faith and doctrine."[6] Such further study would seem to be imperative especially when considering the problem of intercommunion, since the Orthodox position has remained constant, and at Bristol once again the Orthodox felt compelled to remind the Commission that, "Orthodox theology

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 63.

[2] *Loc*. *cit*.

[3] *Loc*. *cit*.

[4] *Loc*. *cit*.

[5] "Report of Section Two," *ibid*., Appendix IV, p. 141.

[6] *Ibid*., p. 142.

XUM

cannot entertain the concept of intercommunion,"[1] and that there must be fundamental agreement in the realm of Faith and Order in order to celebrate communion together.

iv. Centrality

The Uppsala Assembly, building on the work presented at Bristol saw the Eucharist as "the substantial focus"[2] of a catholicity which is an incorporation into Christ and an involvement with all mankind, and it viewed the Church as the form of this catholicity. For the Assembly, "The Eucharist shows the essential meaning of Christian worship,"[3] and this centrality should be reflected in a weekly celebration of the Eucharist as was the custom in the early Christian tradition. For Uppsala, the Eucharist is the substantial focus of a catholicity which involved a unity in Christ and a unity of mankind, a catholicity which was a task and an engagement, and which must be expressed in witness and service "by working for the realization of a genuine humanity."[4] It is an eschatological catholicity which "reaches its completion when what God has already begun in history is finally disclosed and fulfilled."[1] It is a catholic view of the Eucharist shared and explored by Teilhard especially in The Divine Milieu.

---

[1] "Report of the Unity Group," ibid., p. 102.

[2] "The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church," Report of Section One, The Uppsala Report, p. 18.

[3] "Towards New Styles of Living," Report of Section Six, ibid., p. 82.

[4] "The Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church," ibid., p. 14.

5. Summary

i. Question Facing Faith and Order

In the volume exploring the ways of worship among the Churches, in speaking of the problem of the Eucharistic presence of Christ, the Commission Report spoke also of the perennial error which opposes the material and the spiritual.[2] This error, which extends beyond the bounds of sacramental theology to many other areas, calls for a new response especially in the light of the fact of evolution and the unparalleled increase in science and technology. The doctrine of creation has received more and more attention in Faith and Order Studies as they speak of a need for "a Christian understanding of creation,"[3] seeing nature as "a process, as something which is a continuum or developing,"[4] and in this framework attempting

---

[1] Ibid., p. 13.

[2] "Report of the Commission," in Ways of Worship, p. 29.

[3] "Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," (North American Section) Faith and Order Findings, p. 13.

[4] "Reports of the Working Groups," World Conference on Church and Society, Geneva, 1966, p. 197.

XUM

to fashion a better relationship between the Gospel and modern man. It is this current of thought which leads Faith and Order to ask whether the doctrine of creation can provide a means for the expression of the Christian ethic of love in concrete situations, and "does man encounter the will and work of God in creation apart from any confession of God's redemptive work?"[1]

ii. Teilhard's Contribution

There are numerous parallels in the thought of Teilhard and that of Faith and Order, and a distinct convergence upon a framework, compatible to modern man, in which theological discussion can be situated. Teilhard, too, views reality as a process and "from its most distant formulations matter reveals itself to us *in a state of genesis* or becoming..."[2] Nor can there be any opposition between the material and spiritual. Teilhard struggled against such a dichotomy all his life asserting that the spiritual, far from being a separate or opposing entity, is the complementary aspect of an increased material complexity. It is also Teilhard's profound conviction that "the comprehension of nature is theologically

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church," Report of Section One, in *New Directions in Faith and Order*, Appendix III, p. 130.

[2] Teilhard, *The Phenomenon of Man*, p. 145.

XUM

anthropocentric,"[1] for he long developed the concept that "since the birth of thought man has been the leading shoot of the tree of life."[2] In his theology, Teilhard has taken the Incarnation as his starting point in order to understand creation, a starting point shared by the document 'God in Nature and History.' For both the key to understanding all creation is the risen Christ.

Eschatology, too, plays an important role in approaching the study of creation as Faith and Order views creation as the beginning of a process linking inseparably nature, history, and consummation; and Teilhard also sees the Christian mysteries inseparably linked. The cosmic perspective of Teilhard, especially manifested in his view of the Eucharist, is reflected in the Faith and Order document at Montreal where Christian worship is seen as an act by which the Church sees itself identified with the whole creation.[3] His Eucharist theology, dominated by a view which goes beyond the localization and particularization of an individual Eucharist to its 'extension' and sanctification of matter, can be beneficial to a Eucharistic theology concerned with an eschatological and cosmic perspective. Faith and Order's concern with the fulness of the Eucharist of local Church's Eucharistic celebration can be enriched by Teilhard's understanding of the universal aspects of the Eucharist and its place in the economy of the world.

---

[1] "Reports of the Working Groups," World Conference on Church and Society, Geneva, 1966, p. 197.

[2] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 276.

[3] "Worship and the Oneness of Christ's Church," Report of Section Four, The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 71.

For Teilhard man does encounter God's will and work in creation but not absolutely apart from God's redemptive work. Since Teilhard accepts the scotist view of the Incarnation, and sets it in an evolutionary context, this means that all creation is redemptive. Teilhard did not see the world as an indifferent, impersonal or hostile place in which man was lost.[1] His study of the "phenomenology of the world-as-nature" called for by the Committee at Aarhus was embodied in The Phenomenon of Man and was an attempt to show that man, through evolution, is the summation of the entire creative process and is its supreme achievement. So man is located solidly and centrally in the world.

Evolution, then, in Teilhard's view, is the expression of creation in time and space. But this continuous creation is intimately linked with the redemptive work of Christ. In Teilhard's system there was no natural end of

---

[1] Teilhard, then, would reject the viewpoint expressed in the document "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," in New Directions in Faith and Order, pp. 133-140. For Teilhard all creation is creation in Christ and it is necessary to view creation in the light of Heilsgeschichte to comprehend it fully.

XUM

the evolutionary process. Christ is the center of the world and the world could not have two summits any more than a circle could have two centers. The task of the world is not to bring to birth in itself some supreme reality, but to bring itself to fulfillment through union with Christ. From all eternity God is directing the world toward the Parousia. The destiny of the world was to be created in Christ. Creation can be seen and understood best in relation to its end. It is Teilhard's doctrine of creation intimately linked to redemption and viewed eschatologically that provides a means for expressing the Christian ethic of love in concrete situations. Participation in God's creative power is reflected in the Christian action in the world, which participation is the necessary but insufficient condition for the advent of the Parousia. This unified view of Teilhard of creation, redemption, man, and Christian action in the world arising from his synthesis of the phenomenology of the world as nature and the Christian phenomenon is full of possibilities for theologians concerned with Church unity and the sacramental dimensions of the Church's life.

Teilhard attempts to show how it is possible to be centered entirely on God and at the same time to be completely immersed in the struggle for development and progress in the world. His emphasis is primarily on God as the one who brings the universe to its completion.

Creation is less important than consummation. He attempts to establish the Christian as the one best equipped to build the earth and this because of the doctrine of creation and redemption. His dialectical and synthetical treatment of the phenomenonology of all reality gives man a total responsibility for the whole world.

CHAPTER VIII

CREATION AND THE FUTURE OF MAN

1. Teilhard and Creation

In treating of creation, Teilhard's point of view was primarily scientific and phenomenological and remained so throughout his career. At the front during the First War he wrote an essay attempting a philosophical synthesis. This essay, entitled Creative Union, was not written for publication, but as a basis for his ideas, expressed in metaphysical terminology, in the event that they should be found suspect by official censors at some future time. He was not completely satisfied with this essay and attempted a number of times to add to it to clarify his ideas and to add new insights, but "In the end he abandoned this metaphysical inquiry, feeling that the bent of his mind did not lend itself to it."[1]

When he turned his attention to the phenomenon of man five years later, Teilhard made clear his methodology:

> The following pages do not seek to present any philosophy directly; they set out on the contrary, to draw their strength from the careful avoidance of all recourse to metaphysics. Their purpose is to express as objective and simple a vision as possible of humanity considered (as a whole and in

---

[1] Editorial Comment on "Creative Union," in Writings in Time of War, p. 152.

its connections with the Universe) as a phenomenon.[1]

This phenomenological point of view was maintained throughout his writings. It focused on "the law of recurrence which governs the formation of beings,"[2] a law of organization in the universe which links the growth of consciousness to an advance of complexity. It is a law "which can be checked in the phenomenal field and can appropriately be extrapolated into the totality of space and time."[3] It expresses the successive appearance in time of the elements of the universe dealing with phenomena in the process of unification, but not with the ultimate cause of the phenomena as such. It is cosmological rather than ontological.

i. Evolutionary and Continuous

When Teilhard examined the created world, he saw a process of synthesis in which elements unite and through increasing complexity move toward consciousness. Creation is not instantaneous but has progressed over some time and is continuing to happen. Evolution is the expression of creation in space and time. The creative act is one that is continuous and manifests itself through a process of arrangement and unification. From the material universe through the stirrings of life on earth until the appearance of man and up to the present time, Teilhard sees the work of creation in process.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Hominization," in The Vision of the Past, p. 51.

[2] Teilhard, "Creative Union," in Writings in Time of War, p. 158.

[3] Teilhard, "Centrology," in Activation of Energy, p. 99.

God's creative activity is seen by Teilhard in its unity. For him "creation is not a periodic intrusion of the First Cause--it is an act co-extensive with the whole duration of the universe."[1] Teilhard's unified view of reality led him to reject any view of God's creative activity which would multiply the contingent and the arbitrary in the world. He sees the principal aim of the development of the cosmos as progression toward greater consciousness. Creation continues and the evolutionary forces have not ceased operating because the threshold of reflection has been passed. There is one creative action of God which continues to raise creatures towards fuller being. Seen from within God's creation is expressed in a transformation. There is one continuous activity expressed in an evolutionary movement. Teilhard rejects any notion that such a transformist view is incompatible with God as First Cause or the idea of creation ex nihilo. Rather he says:

> For the Christian transformist, God's creative action is no longer conceived as an intrinsic

---

[1] Teilhard, "On the Notion of Creative Transformation," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 23.

XUM

> thrusting of His works into the midst of pre-existent beings, but as a bringing to birth of the successive stages of His work in the heart of things. It is no less essential, no less universal, no less intimate either on that account.[1]

God, as Creator, is viewed first of all as the God who is ahead, drawing all things out of non-being towards fuller being. Teilhard believes that in matter there is an inner teleological motivation and although this cannot be verified below a certain level of complexity, nevertheless it is still operative. When consciousness is attained, verification is possible. So God the Creator by his continuous and evolutionary creative activity works from the very heart of matter.

It seemed to Teilhard that the conflict between science and religion was intensified around this very point of creative activity. Religion was disposed to make room for God's creative activity and intervention in nature, while science strongly upheld the stability of its natural laws. By attempting a reconciliation between science and religion with this one continuous evolutionary principle of operation involved in both spirit and matter, Teilhard hoped to provide points of contact between the science and theology. He did not want science and religion to divide the phenomenon between them, each taking what it considers to be its rightful object, but to allow each to investigate the total phenomenon each from its own point of view.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Transformist Paradox," in The Vision of the Past, p. 102. Note One.

ii. And Human Activity

While Teilhard was unwilling to concern himself with a metaphysics of creation, he was very much concerned with any theology of creation that was detrimental to or that discouraged human effort. He believed that a theology that negated the world or belittled human hopes falsified Christianity and hindered the true development of the world to its terms. The modern temper was humanistic and secularistic relying on science and technology and placing great value on this world. It was his contention that "in a few generations, mankind has been literally and spontaneously _converted_ to a sort of religion of the world" which was directed toward "a passionate faith in the value and potentialities of human effort."[1] He was critical of a Christianity that was strongly attracted to spiritual world view to the neglect of the values of this world. What was needed, he felt, were "men who were all the more convinced of the sacred value of human effort in that they are primarily interested in God."[2]

It was this concern that led Teilhard to reject a theology that downgraded human effort, and to criticize any philosophical approach which would support such a theology. It was his contention that the theology of creation which was a product of the scholasticism of the Middle Ages was deficient in its ability to grasp the modern mind and to move men to action by embracing the world. His harshest criticism fell upon the notion of participated being which he believed so stressed the radical contingency of the universe and the complete gratuitousness of creation that man could lose his zest for action. He said, "Philosophically we are still living in an antiquated body of thought, governed by the notions of immobility and substance,"[1] and felt that an entirely gratuitous creation stressing a radical contingency could not satisfy the modern mind which had awakened to the immensities of space-time and the dynamic force of evolution. He said

---

[1] Teilhard, "Modern Unbelief," in _Science and Christ_, p. 114.

[2] Teilhard, "The Religious Value of Research," _ibid_., p. 204.

> Strictly deduced from a particular metaphysics of potency and act, this thesis of creation's complete gratuitousness was acceptable in the Thomistic framework of a static universe in which all the creature had to do was to accept his existence and effect his own salvation. By contrast, it becomes dangerous and virulent (because disheartening) as soon as, in a system of cosmogenesis, the 'participated being' we all are begins to wonder whether the radically contingent condition to which the theologians reduce it really justifies the pain and labour required for evolution.[2]

---

[1] Teilhard, "Action and Activation," ibid., p. 182.

[2] Teilhard, "The Contingence of the Universe," ibid., pp. 224-225.

Teilhard's corrective to this view of the world's contingency was to stress the union of Christ with the universe through his election as Head of Creation. He saw creation as creation in Christ. His corrective to contingence is not given on philosophical grounds but on the data of revelation: "It is the philosophy of the universe expressed in terms of the notion of the mystical body."[1] The result of the Incarnation is not only the growth of the Mystical Body of Christ but the Pleroma, and Teilhard can say "it is not the sense of contingence of the created but the sense of the mutual completion of the world and God which gives life to Christianity."[2]

A creation which is entirely gratuitous and simply a gesture on the part of God whose only object is to share his plenitude with creatures of whom he has no need, when seen in the context of the modern world, seems to deny any substantiality to man's effort and participation and to diminish the dignity of the human life. By attempting to unite man more closely to his creator and by establishing him as a collaborator in creation, Teilhard hoped to restore to man his zest for living.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Creative Union," in Writings in Time of War, p. 174.

[2] Teilhard, "The Contingence of the Universe," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 227.

iii. Christic

The theory of Teilhard in regard to creation "far from being a merely rational speculation, depends upon revelation and it is intrinsically theological."[1] It is an explanation using two sources of knowledge and Mooney notes that "in strict theological terminology its precise object would not be 'creation' but 'elevation,' that is to say, creation in Christ."[2] Teilhard's notion of creation is Christic. It does not set aside the Incarnation but is explicated precisely with the Incarnation in mind. For Teilhard, following what he believes to be the thought of John and Paul

> The Incarnation is a making new, a restoration, of all the universe's forces and powers; Christ is the Instrument, the Centre, the End, of the whole of animate and material creation; through Him, everything is created, sanctified and vivified.[3]

Christic creation reaffirms the primacy of Christ over all the created world. For Teilhard this modifies the notion that the creation of the world is completely arbitrary. It stresses the complementarity of the Creator and all creation. God has freely placed himself in creation and freely willed to establish a complementary bond between himself and the world. The world, then, cannot be a matter of indifference to God, nor so utterly contingent that it is superfluous. God is personally involved in it.

---

[1] Faricy, Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the Christian in the World, p. 12.

[2] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 170.

[3] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in Writings in Time of War, p. 58.

iv. Through Union

Teilhard has chosen to follow what he terms "the way of synthesis."[1] The act of creation is through the act of unification. True union, however, demands a center, and the center which is Christ is foreseen from the very moment of the creative act. One cannot conceive of creation in Teilhard's system without seeing it centered on Christ. The object of creation is a universe and creation comes about by an evolutive process which is unifying. It is Christ who is the unifying force in this movement.

> He in whom all was created--he 'in quo omnia constant'--he who, by his birth and his blood, restores every creature to his Father' the Christ of the eucharist and the parousia, the cosmic, consummating Christ of St. Paul.[2]

This passage summarizes the total unitive force of creation in Christ. Christ the center of unity moving the world to greater unity, especially through the Eucharist, consummating all in the parousia. Christ, identifiable with

---

[1] Teilhard, "Action and Activation," in Science and Christ, p. 184.

[2] Teilhard, "Suggestions for a New Theology," in Christianity and Evolution, p. 179.

XUM

Omega, is not only the moving force in the unification process, but is also the point towards which creation advances to its ultimate union. The process of creation is not simply a process of cosmogenesis reaching its term but becomes a process of Christogenesis. For the union which creates and the formation of the Pleroma are ultimately Christogenesis. The effort of Teilhard has been to reformulate the static theology of creation in terms of a genesis, a becoming of the universe in Christ in which Christ will be all in all.

2. Building the Earth

It was Teilhard's abiding conviction that "the world will never be converted to Christianity's hopes of heaven, unless first Christianity is converted (so it may divinize them) to the hopes of the earth."[1] He believed that a false spirituality leading to a rejection of the world confronting a renewed interest in the world stimulated by science and technology was widening the gulf between Christians and non-Christians on the necessity of building the earth and on the value of man's role in such a creative effort. Teilhard believed that very often the Christian teaching of the reality of the transcendent supplied a secure way of escape from accepting the responsibilities of the world and gave little value to the progress that man makes in the present world. With an eternal home awaiting the faithful Christian, the human enterprise can seem fruitless and of little lasting interest. The Christian could identify with the City of God, but could justifiably receive the criticisms of non-Christians for his lack of interest in, and identification with, the City of Man.

---

[1] Teilhard, "Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 127.

The question that Teilhard sought to answer was how a person who has faith in Christ and who seriously believes in the resurrection can continue to accept the value of any worldly effort. He could not accept that in any way a Christian "must renounce being a man, a man in the full extent and depth of the word, avidly and passionately a man."[1] He wanted a Christianity which would give man a love of God's creation and an impulse to develop the world to its fullest. He felt that "Christianity, in the form we preach it, lacks sufficient contagious power"[2] and believed that what was needed was a larger vision than previously obtained, "a Christology proportionate to the dimensions now attributed to the universe."[3] In his view, such a Christology would demand "developing a

---

[1] Teilhard, "Cosmic Life," in Writings in Time of War, p. 17.

[2] Teilhard, "Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 125.

[3] Ibid., p. 122.

XUM

gospel of human conquest."[1] He believed that "heaven can be attained only through the completion of the earth and the world--which are both now much larger and more unfinished than we used to think."[2] The road to heaven is not that which leaves the world behind but one which must go through the earth. He says: "Beneath our individual strivings toward spiritualisation, the world slowly accumulates, starting with the whole of matter, that which will make of it the Heavenly Jerusalem or the New Earth."[3]

For Teilhard the attraction exerted by Christ, the center of creation, gives a unitive principle into one's spiritual life which sanctifies human effort and humanizes Christian life. He tried to bridge the gap which often exists between a life of prayer and the work-a-day world, recognizing that many sincere Christians feel that "time spent at the office or the studio, in the fields or in the factory, is time diverted from prayer and adoration."[4] He reacted strongly against "the invalidity of these impressions"[5] and tried to give a renewed and more dynamic understanding of the Christian concept of sanctification through the duties of one's station in life. He says

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid., pp. 122-123.

[3] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 30.

[4] Ibid., p. 34.

[5] Loc. cit.

> Our work appears to us in the main as a way of earning our daily bread. But its essential virtue is of a higher order: through it we complete in ourselves the subject of the divine union; and through it again we augment in some sense, in relation to ourselves, the divine end of that union.[1]

It is this concept of completion and augmentation that is specifically Teilhardian in character. To build the world is not simply to attend to its natural development, but to its development in the light of the Incarnation. And to build the earth is not merely to be involved extrinsically, but to be involved intrinsically in its completion. For "by virtue of the Creation and, still more, of the Incarnation, nothing here below is profane for those who know how to see." And this seeing involves the Christian's attachment to Christ which gives a connection "even physical and natural"[2] between his work and the building of the Kingdom.

i. Man's Role in Creation

Teilhard's view of man being united to Christ and building the earth is in itself neither new or startling for the Church has always maintained this in principle. Christian teaching has always insisted upon the Christian's

---

[1] Ibid., p. 32.

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

XUM

developing all his talents in the service of God and for our own sanctification. In actual practice, however, as can be seen from the long unhappy relationship of science and religion, the development of the City of God and the City of Man have often been in conflict. It seems that in the twentieth century the conflict has deepened, since an increase in science and technology usually has intensified the conflict, and the almost incredible scientific and knowledge explosion of the past fifty years or more has made it more acute. The failure of many Christian nations to solve the many ills and injustices that plague their society, and the challenge of marxism to build a better world, have served to highlight the need for Christianity to renew itself to meet these challenges. To Teilhard there was an apparent dichotomy between faith in Christ and faith in the world. He does not believe that it is rooted in any doctrine of Christianity, but from a misinterpretation of Christianity that has become almost traditional. He says:

> The primary source of modern unbelief is to be looked for in the illegitimate schism which gradually, since the Renaissance, has separated Christianity from what we would call the natural human religious current. The present world, as I understand it, is not radically unbelieving or a-religious. But its natural power of adoration is directed toward an Object, the Universe, which appears to be in opposition with the Christian goal.[1]

---

[1] Teilhard, 'La Vie Intellectuel,' from "New Dimension of Spirit in Man's Development," by Virginia M. Shaddy, in Dimensions of the Future, ed. by

XUM

Teilhard's originality in approaching this problem was in stressing the intimate connection between Christ and the universe and the corresponding relationship of the Christian's work in bringing about the completion of the world and the Pleroma. Man's work, because it is intrinsic to this process, has value in itself and has a value that is lasting. And he believes that unless man's work has lasting value he will eventually lose the will to act. He could not be satisfied with the notion that one's actions are unimportant and that it is only intention or disposition that matters. He does not discount the value of work done with good will and intention. He says that a correct attitude "exalts the initial and basic role of intention"[1] which opens the inward world to the presence of God. But for Teilhard this is not enough. He believes that the work itself must somehow be "'exteranlized and saved'."[2]

For Teilhard, God the Creator has called man to be a co-creator, and man's works joins the creative work of God and continues it. Teilhard did not want to confuse the profane and the sacred, but wanted to afford each its own autonomy without separating them. The sacred is the

---

Marvin Kessler, S.J., and Bernard Brown, S.J. (Washington and Cleveland: Corpus Books, 1968), p. 103.

[1] Teilhard, _The_ _Divine_ _Milieu_, p. 23.

[2] _Loc_. _cit_.

XUM

deepest dimension of the profane and every human task has a sacred aspect. So salvation of the world cannot be effected by purely natural effort. Nevertheless human effort is a necessary preparation for the coming of God's kingdom. The Christian must labor for the progress of the earth that is required to bring about the Kingdom. Teilhard speaks of the "_union sacrée_, the Common Front of all those who believe that the world is still advancing."[1] He desires mankind to have "a passionate desire to conquer the World and a passionate longing to be united with God."[2]

ii. Building the Kingdom

In the scheme of Teilhard the evolutionist, "nothing in our progressive world is truly intelligible until it has reached its end."[3] And since man can in no way calculate the time when the Kingdom will be established, Teilhard states that "the consummation of that Kingdom outruns any distinct imaginative effort."[4] He believes, however, that while scripture does not give an explicit

---

[1] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on Progress," in _The Future of Man_, p. 80.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 81.

[3] Teilhard, "Pantheism and Christianity," in _Christianity and Evolution_, p. 66.

[4] _Loc_. _cit_.

XUM

picture of what God's Kingdom will be like, he does believe that it does witness in a general way to what will occur. Teilhard accepts as valid "the whole Christian view of individual freedom and personal salvation,"[1] while recognizing at the same time that "however individual our salvation may be from many points of view, it is in consequence accomplished only in a collective fulfilment."[2] He accepts as scriptural that "the Incarnation ends in the building up of a living church, of a mystical body, of a consummated totality, of a pleroma (to use St. Paul's word that defies translation)."[3]

Teilhard took this as his perspective as he analysed the world in evolution. Mankind's progress is a convergent progress and the growth and maturity of humanity approach a particular point in the future. It is at this point, Teilhard believes, that God will establish his Kingdom. This state of humanity will by no means establish the Kingdom, but rather will be a condition necessary to its coming. The ultimate end of the earth is not that of natural evolution. It is dominated by the second coming of Christ. There is no natural outcome for the world's end.

Teilhard does not deny the gratuity of God's intervention in the world at the end of time. What he wants to affirm is that this coming will not be a completely arbitrary event having no connection with the world's progress. Just as the Incarnation was an intervention of God, so too will the Parousia be a divine intervention. But just as the Incarnation took place in the fulness of time, so Teilhard believes that the Parousia will also take place in the future of time. When the Mystical Christ has completed his own forming and attained his full growth then he will gather in all that is to be saved. Christians through their creative efforts and in Christ prepare for this time "though they cannot master or measure its mysterious and profound significance."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 69.

[2] Ibid., p. 67.

[3] Loc. cit.

iii. Ultimate End of the Earth

In speculating on the end of the earth in a purely rational fashion, without recourse to revelation, Teilhard does not see the death and destruction of the world, but following his phenomenological system of union he envisions "the very success of unification and co-reflexion,"[2] the "internal introversion upon itself of the noosphere."[3] This is the point of planetary maturation. But in maintaining his unified Christian vision of the world which sees that "God is at the birth, the growth and the ultimate end of all things" and that "Christ is the instrument, the centre, the end of all animate and material Creation," Teilhard's optimism is supported by his faith. As he notes in The Phenomenon of Man, the final success of hominization is "positively guaranteed"[1] by the Incarnation.

---

[1] Teilhard, "The End of the Species," in The Future of Man, p. 305.

[2] Ibid., p. 302.

[3] Teilhard, The Phenomenon of Man, p. 287.

The Incarnation is a renewal and a restoration of all the powers and forces in the universe. Christ is still forming himself in his people and still growing in his mystical Body. Creation is the process of unification and so the Parousia will occur "in a Creation brought to the paroxysm of its aptitude for union," revealing "the unique process of assimilation and synthesis, pursued from the beginning of time...."[2] and the universal Christ will be revealed. And, as Teilhard says "then the organic complex will have been constituted of God and the world-- The Pleroma...."[3]

The end of the world, then, will be a transformation and a birth. The world will be de-centered from itself and transformed to be entirely centered on Christ. It will be at this time, Teilhard speculates, that

---

[1] Ibid., p. 307. Footnote One.

[2] Teilhard, "Conclusion," in The Future of Man, p. 307.

[3] Ibid., p. 308.

> Mankind will for the first time be confronted with the necessity for a truly and wholly human act, a final exercise of choice--the yes or no in the face of God, individually affirmed by beings in each of whom will be fully developed the sense of human liberty and responsibility...[1]

For Teilhard, the end of the world, just as much as the Parousia, is a matter of faith.

3. Parousia

The doctrine of Christ's second coming received much attention from Teilhard since he found it to be extraordinarily rich, and as an evolutionist it provided him with a concept to complement his analysis of reality. He believed it to be fundamental to Christianity but felt it had been greatly neglected. He says:

> On the horizon of the Christian world the Parousia (that is, Christ's return in glory at the end of time) occupies a central place--something which, because men have been waiting for it for so many centuries, is easily forgotten. In this unique and supreme event, in which (as the Faith teaches us) the historic is to be fused with the Transcendental, the mystery of the Incarnation culminates and is made manifest with the realization of a physical 'elucidation' of the universe.[2]

This second coming, like the first, Teilhard clearly maintains, is a free and unmerited gift on God's part to mankind. But although it is completely gratuitous it is not unrelated to man's effort to build the earth because of its likeliness to occur after sufficient planetary maturation and because of its power to motivate man. Teilhard is aware of the Gospel injunction that it is fruitless to speculate about the time and the modality of the Parousia, but insists that Christians are called to await it. He believes that the expectation of Christ's second coming is "perhaps the supreme Christian function and the most distinctive characteristic of our religion."[1] He believed that a number of factors has dulled this expectation--the expectation of the early Christians of Christ's imminent return and its non-realization, the tenacious resistance of the world to good, a certain pessimism due to an exaggerated conception of original sin,[2] but insisted that the "parousiac spark"[3] must be kindled again. He believed that this could be accomplished by "the perception of a more intimate connection between the victory of Christ and the outcome of the work which our human effort here below is seeking to construct."[4] It was this perspective which would give hope to man and value to his efforts. It would allow him to have faith

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 306.

[2] Teilhard, "Trois Choses que Je Vois," (1948, unpublished essay, Library of the American Teilhard de Chardin Society, New York City), p. 7.

---

[1] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 134.

[2] Ibid., p. 135.

[3] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," in The Future of Man, p. 267.

[4] Teilhard, The Divine Milieu, p. 136.

XUM

in the world as well as faith in Christ and would help to bridge the gap between the church and the modern world.

Both the Second Coming of Christ and human maturation take place primarily on the level of person and of spirit. For Teilhard "the Parousia depends upon planetary maturation, which in turn depends upon a hyperpersonalization which can be brought about only through love."[1] It is Christ who is the source of such a personalizing love and it is the Church which is its locus. So the Church plays an indispensable role in the Second Coming of Christ.

i. The Parousia and the Church

The Church prepares the world for the Second Coming of Christ by incorporating men into Christ. It is through Christ and the Church that men are bound to Christ and to each other in love and are personalized. The role of the Church in human progress is to infuse the power of Christian love into the evolutionary process. It is the love of Christ which impels men to unite with each other and to overcome the evil which tends to hinder their growth in union and their ultimate progress. The progress of the earth must be Christified and only then will it reach its point of freedom in the Second Coming of Christ.

For Teilhard the Church is the Christified part

---

[1] Mooney, Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ, p. 187.

XUM

of the world which is aware of itself as such. It is the place where the world and Christ have already met and where Christ is present radiating his love to move the world to fulfilment. It is "not just the teaching church, now, but the living church--the seed of super-vitalization planted at the heart of the noosphere by the appearance in history of Jesus Christ."[1]

ii. The New Christian

Teilhard wanted to liberate Christianity from what he considered to be a residue of Manicheism, a Christianity which was presented so often as being against the legitimate desires of the world. He saw the essential problem of the modern religious crisis as the problem of the two faiths, "Faith in God or faith in man or in the world."[2] He was very much aware of the criticisms of influential thinkers such as Freud and Marx and Nietzsche who would free mankind from tutelage to the Church. He experienced the split between the Church and the world of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and watched the spread of secular culture. He felt that man's secular work and worldly aspirations, far from being an obstacle to his spiritual growth, must be included in his

---

[1] Teilhard, "Outline of a Dialectic of Spirit," in Activation of Energy, p. 149.

[2] Teilhard, "The Religious Value of Research," in Science and Christ, p. 202.

XUM

religion and be placed at the service of Christ for the good of the world.

His approach to this situation was to insist that faith in the world and faith in God are not in opposition to each other, but "they represent the two essential components of a complete humano-Christian mysticism."[1] Both are necessary and both complement each other. He was convinced that secularism was not adequate to meet the demands of the time and move the world forward, but neither was he sure that the traditional interpretation of the Christian faith was adequate to its task. So he examined the teachings of modern Christianity both in their content and form and attempted to bring them into line with the contemporary world view and the needs of the world. It was a task which was to continue throughout his life time. Tresmontant says:

> Teilhard spent his life fighting against a certain metaphysics, a certain theology, and a certain spirituality which do not correspond with anything real or essential in the Church; he fought an ensemble of misunderstandings...he fought against the sociological phenomenon of the perversion of Christian spirituality.[2]

Teilhard struggled then against what he considered to be a distorted view of Christianity. He attempted to correct those things he viewed as distortions, while always remaining firmly convinced that Christianity remained the supreme motivating force for human progress. Yet he realized that "Christianity will lose, to the extent that it fails to embrace as it should everything that is human on earth, the keen edge of its vitality and its full power to attract."[1] Teilhard was convinced that a religion is condemned if it fails to measure up to the human ideal. It was his task to maintain the human ideal and develop it further through the Church which, he believed, has in Jesus Christ, the very model of the ideal.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 203.

[2] Claude Tresmontant, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin His Thought, trans. by Salvator Attanasio (Baltimore: Helicon, 1959), p. 81.

Since creation is far from being finished, either in its individual aspects or in the collective end toward which it is directed, the Kingdom of God, then, must speak in some fashion to the natural progress of the world. The Christian is the one "faithful to earth"[2] who is no longer simply a creature but also a creator.

In Teilhard's mind this openness to the modern world and its immensity called for a new type of sanctity. Imitation of past forms of spirituality would not satisfy modern man. He felt that man must not only renew his faith in man but in mankind as well. He detected a fundamental impulse in modern man which was taking two directions:

---

[1] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," in The Future of Man, p. 265.

[2] Teilhard, "The Grand Option," ibid., p. 44.

"the spirit (let us call it 'Christian') of sacrifice and union centered in the expectation of an Apotheosis in the future; and...the Promethean or Faustian spirit of self-worship based on the material organization of the earth."[1] Ever the synthesizer, he believed that this ambiguity could be resolved if Christianity revealed that "Faith in God, detached as it may be, sublimates in us a rising tide of human aspirations."[2]

Teilhard refuses to see the basic split in humanity in the categories of the Christian versus the secular world or democracy versus totalitarianism. He sees it rather between those who see and believe in progress and those who are closed and fixed in their attitudes. He says that "a passionate longing to grow, to be, is what we need... Life is ceaseless discovery. Life is movement."[3] But not all directions are good for the advance of man. Only that which "finds its expression in greater cohesion and greater human solidarity."[4]

iii. The Christian in the World

The emphasis on the growing importance of the world

---

[1] Teilhard, "Faith in Man," *ibid*., p. 191.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 192.

[3] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on Progress," *ibid*., p. 72.

[4] *Loc*. *cit*.

XUM

constitutes, in Mooney's opinion, Teilhard's "single most significant contribution to modern Christian spirituality."[1] His emphasis is strongly on the material and the personal, on the motivating force of the world in progress and the desire of the Christian of today to reach God through the world. He sees a particular relationship between the material world and man's relationship to God; and calls for an attitude, not of grudging acceptance of the world and its progress, but of welcome acceptance. His view of history led him to affirm that "through the centuries life has become an increasingly heavy burden for Man the Species, just as it does for Man the Individual as the years pass."[2] The complexity of the modern world with its technology and scientific discoveries, its newly found immensities both in the apparently limitless universe and in the microscopic depths of matter, and its ability to intensify man's alienation from the world and from his fellow men, all affect modern man profoundly and very often pessimistically.

For Teilhard, however, the modern world is filled with possibilities. He saw the "rising social standards, the rise of the Machine, the growth of Knowledge"[3]

---

[1] Christopher F. Mooney, from "A Modern Christian Spirituality," in Dimensions of the Future, p. 20.

[2] Teilhard, "Life and the Planets," in The Future of Man, p. 117.

[3] Teilhard, "Does Mankind Move Biologically

XUM

not as something fortuitous but as part of the inevitable progress of a world in maturation. It is a world whose complexity and immensity demands of a man a new sense of purpose and an increase of faith. To Teilhard, what is needed to sustain man confronted by such forces is "the hope, the belief that some immense fulfilment lies ahead of us."[1] He saw the progress of the world as inevitable and believed that it must be controlled and directed. He concluded that "the earth is more likely to stop turning than is Mankind, as a whole, likely to stop organising and unifying itself,"[2] for "it is as impossible for mankind not to unite upon itself as it is for the human intelligence not to go on indefinitely deepening its thought."[3]

Teilhard embraced the world because he was convinced that it had purpose and direction. He was not cowed by the immensity and complexity of the cosmos. He recognized that in regard to life "in terms of Time its whole planetary duration is no more than a flash in the huge course of sidereal development"[4] and could speak

---

Upon Itself?," ibid., p. 249.

[1] Teilhard, "Life and the Planets," ibid., p. 117.

[2] Teilhard, "Faith in Peace," ibid., p. 152.

[3] Teilhard, "The Planetization of Mankind," ibid., p. 128.

[4] Teilhard, "Turmoil or Genesis," ibid., p. 215.

convincingly and knowledgeably about "the apparent insignificance of the phenomenon of Life in terms of the cosmos--a little mould on a grain of dust."[1] But his constant point of reference was that human life is not an accident, or an epiphenomenon in the world, but the central phenomenon of evolution. It continues the purpose and direction of the universe which is toward personalisation through unification.

Man, then, is no stranger in the universe or an alien growth. He is the very realization of its purpose seeking an increase in spirit and growth in personalisation. And it is here that Teilhard sees the power and purpose of Christianity. It is the Christian faith which through the Incarnation accepts the "tangible values of the world and Matter,"[2] and the pre-eminence of the personal. It is Christianity which reveals to the world that its unification is to be sought and realized "not in the sole contemplation of a single Truth or in the sole desire for a single thing, but in the common attraction exercised by a single Being."[3]

---

[1] _Loc_. _cit_.

[2] Teilhard, "The Heart of the Problem," _ibid_., p. 267.

[3] Teilhard, "Some Reflections on Progress," _ibid_., p. 75.

4. Faith and Order and Eschatology

In the Preamble to the reports of the Lausanne Conference, the representatives of the many Christian Churches, united in a common faith in Jesus Christ, announced that the Conference had assembled to discuss matters of Faith and Order and stated, "It is emphatically _not_ attempting to define the conditions of future reunion."[1] In the reports issued by the Conference scarcely any mention was made of the eschatological dimension of the Christian hope, yet time and theological investigations have revealed the importance of eschatology for the ecumenical movement since "it directs the view of the separated churches _ahead_ to the Lord..."[2] and it is this impulse which helps to draw the churches into unity.

Edinburgh spoke of the Church rejoicing in the Kingdom of God whenever man obeys God's will, but said that "the Church always looks with glad expectation to the consummation of the Kingdom in the future,"[3] since Christ is still to be shown forth in glory. The discussion of the reports reflected various ecclesiological suppositions

---

[1] The Preamble, _Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne_, p. 459.

[2] Lukas Vischer, _Studia Liturgica_, Summer, 1966, p. 78.

[3] "The Church of Christ and the Word of God," Chapter Three, _The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh_, pp. 232-233.

XUM

as some delegates stressed the link between the Church and the Kingdom of God and others the distinction. Some emphasized the presence of the Kingdom within the Church, and believed that the coming of the Kingdom can be seen in the Church's progress in the world and the work of the faithful. Others stressed the Kingdom which is to come, holding that the Church knows the Kingdom by faith only and its progress is hidden and will remain so until the end of the age. Thus the delegates were led to say that, "We are not yet of one mind about (a) the relationship of the Church to the Kingdom, and (b) the extent to which the Kingdom is made known here and now."[1]

Amsterdam concentrated much effort in trying to apprehend the place of the Universal Church in God's design. While gratefully acknowledging their agreement that the Church is "partaking already, by faith, in the eternity of the Kingdom of God and waiting for the consummation when Christ shall come again in the fullness of His glory and power, the Assembly delegates determined to seek a solution to their disagreement on "the degree to which the Kingdom of God can be said to be already realized within the Church."[2] It was evident in the Gospels that the central message of Jesus was concerned with the Kingdom of God and not the Church. Still the proclamation of Jesus was not concerned with future events only, but the rule of God was already present in his own ministry.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 233.

[2] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One, _Man's Disorder and God's Design_, Vol. I., p. 207.

There was a growing concern for wholeness and for history as the members of Faith and Order pursued their study of unity. In preparation for the Amsterdam Assembly, Bishop Newbigin had written: "There is revealed in the Gospel the meaning and end of history both for the individual and for the race,"[1] and he saw the Gospel as "the revelation of the meaning and end of history as a whole."[2] It is the Gospel which reveals that God's purpose is to sum up all things in Christ. (Ephesians 1:10) This concern was reflected in the statement which was commended to the churches for study and comment by the Central Committee at Rolle in 1951. In discussing the biblical basis for the Church's unity and apostolicity, the statement declares that they rest upon "the whole redeeming work of Christ - past, present and future."[3] And so "the obligation to take the Gospel to the whole world, and the obligation to draw all Christ's people together both rest upon Christ's

---

[1] Lesslie Newbigin, 'The Duty and Authority of the Church to Preach the Gospel,' in "The Church's Witness to God's Design," Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. III, p. 34.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] "The calling of the Church to Mission and to Unity," Received by the Central Committee at Rolle, 1951, in A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement, p. 178.

XUM

whole work, and are indissolubly connected."[1] The Church's unity rests not only on the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus but "upon His promise that He will come again. In His final victory the Kingdoms of the world will be His..."[2]

Although this has far-reaching implications for the world missionary task, still the interpretation of biblical revelation in regard to eschatology allowed the document only to state that, "while we are agreed in looking for Christ's final victory, we are not agreed as to the manner of his victory, and as to its relation to what we may rightly hope for within history."[3]

i. Interest Grows

At Lund the interest of Faith and Order in eschatology was evident. As one delegate put it: "At this moment the ecumenical movement is showing a remarkable, necessary, indispensable interest in what theologians call 'eschatology'..."[4] In commenting on the image of the Church as a Pilgrim People, Professor Schlink said,

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 179.

[2] *Loc*. *cit*.

[3] *Loc*. *cit*.

[4] Pierre Maury, Paper Presented at Lund (no title), in "The Social and Cultural Factors in Church Divisions," Chapter Five, *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 203.

XUM

"Only in the expectation of the Second Coming will we understand the biblical testimonies concerning the first Coming of our Lord."[1] The reports reflect this interest, especially the section on Christ and His Church, where it states that at the end of the pilgrimage Jesus "will come again to meet His Church in order to complete His work of redemption and judgment." Because the Spirit dwells in the Church, "the new age of the future is already present," and the Church "is already given to participate in the power of the resurrection." It "belongs essentially to the new age and the new creation" and looks "beyond its historical forms to the full unveiling of its new being in the coming Lord."[2]

In attempting to come to grips with the problem of the relationship of Church, world and kingdom, the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme of Evanston offered the belief that "the long history of this world which God created and sustains from day to day...is not rendered meaningless by the coming of His Kingdom. Nor, on the other hand, is His Kingdom simply the final outcome of this world's history."[3] They put it quite succinctly by stating:

---

[1] Edmund Schlink, 'The Pilgrim People of God,' in "The Task of Faith and Order in a Pilgrim Church," Chapter Four, ibid., p. 161.

[2] "Christ and His Church," Chapter Two, ibid., p. 20.

[3] "Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme of the Second Assembly: Christ the Hope of the

XUM

"There is no straight line from the labours of men to the Kingdom of God."[1] This is certainly a crucial point to discuss with Teilhard.

Yet, since history has meaning, there must be a line of some sort between man's work and God's Kingdom. They are not unrelated. There must not only be hope, but signs of hope, if man is to pursue God's will. And Evanston acknowledged that if society strives to recognize and respect human dignity, if it seeks social justice for its members, and seeks to eliminate war and poverty and despair, then "all these witness to His coming."[2]

The delegates at Evanston said, too, that, "it is certain that the perfect unity of the Church will not be totally achieved until God sums up all things in Christ,"[3] while stating that this unity is presently being realized in history. The Orthodox delegates, however, were not entirely satisfied with this concept, declaring that, "the perfect unity' must not be interpreted exclusively as a realization at the Second Coming of Christ."[4] For the

---

World," *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. VI, no. 4 (July, 1954), p. 439.

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] "The Statement on the Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme," *The Evanston Report*, p. 71.

[3] "Our Oneness in Christ and our Disunity as Churches," Report of Section One, *ibid.*, p. 88.

[4] "The Declaration of the Orthodox Delegates Concerning Faith and Order, *ibid.*, p. 94.

XUM

Orthodox delegates the unity of the Church ought to be viewed as a present reality looking towards its consummation in the Last Day, and should not be understood only eschatologically. In their statement on the main theme the Orthodox delegates supported the stress placed upon the Second Coming in regard to Christian Hope, but added: "We strongly believe that it is necessary to place an adequate emphasis on the actual presence of the Kingdom of God in the Church."[1]

The North American Theological Commission, in its Report on Christ and the Church submitted to the Montreal Conference on Faith and Order after some ten years of study and work, attempted to speak to the problem of the relationship between the Church and world. Reflecting the concern for wholeness the Commission adopted the "catholic" methodology, a methodology which "seeks to understand the fullness and the wholeness of God's activity; it is a form of response to the new creation, the new world with its new horizon."[2] Their thinking about the world and its meaning was governed by the central revelation of God in Christ. The Church is the instrument through which Jesus works in history, so they first had to speak of Christ and his relationship "both to the world viewed as the totality of God's creation and to the 'world' viewed as hostile to God."[1] By this hostility was meant the fallen world of sin and death.[2] The goodness of God's creation was extolled and the world seen as the expression of God's love and the "vast sphere of God's glory."[3] Yet their comments on the eschatological dimension of judgment reveal the tension still unresolved in the eschatological problem for the Church "is not, in empirical fact, the reality which it ought to be, and which eschatologically it already is."[4]

---

[1] "A Statement of the Eastern Orthodox Delegates Concerning the Main Theme of the Assembly," ibid., Appendix VIII, p. 330.

[2] "Introduction: Report of the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church," (North American Section), Faith and Order Findings, p. 11.

ii. Church and World

The Montreal Conference indicated to the members of Faith and Order that even the Christological approach adopted after Lund was too narrow a basis for their discussions, and that a study should be undertaken treating of the relationship between Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church. Six aspects of biblical study were suggested at Aarhus, first among which was the aspect of "Nature's sharing with man in the consummation of all things in Christ," as well as nature sharing in the results of man's disobedience.[1] The working paper, "God in Nature and History," presented to the Commission at Bristol was an attempt to deal with a concept of nature and history which was not static, but dynamic, a nature which for modern man was not a "geocentric, limited entity, but a process..."[2] It recognized some form of continuity between history and consummation, speaking of the New Testament approach as one where "the future is seen as the complete and radical display of God's victorious work in history."[3] It is Christ the New Man who leads the process of history to its goal, and so "*consummation is a far higher work than creation*."[4]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 23.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 23. Footnote One.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 31.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 25.

Creation, itself, in New Testament usage includes both man and non-human nature. "Man is the junction, where all the lives between God and his earthly creation come together."[5] History is seen as "the totality of human events in past, present and future, as governed by God and directed towards his goal."[6] Creation is the first history and "the process of God's creative work has not yet come to an end."[1] Living in history, then, demands looking constantly to the future which is open. The relationship between consummation and history in process is one of discontinuity and continuity. The earth is to be renewed and recreated according to the new humanity of the resurrected Christ. As Christ died and rose, so all of creation will have to undergo an analogous process. This analogy, then, allows closer identification between the labors of men and the Second Coming. "It may be believed that our works in the Church of Christ (I Cor. 3:14) and our cultural achievements (Rev. 21:24,26) will be used as building stones for the Kingdom of God."[2] Activities which produce a world more free, more human and more loving have a function of continuity, allowing the belief, therefore, that, "Consummation will mean a new and far more thorough-going display of man's freedom and dominion."[3] And because of the close connection between man and creation, then the consummation of creation may be spoken of in an analogous way. Renewal of creation results from man's renewal in his relationships with God and neighbor. Man's body, his most intimate connection with creation, will be renewed in the resurrection revealing that matter is not accidental to man, but essential. Technology and scientific

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation, and the Unity of the Church," Report of Committee I, as Amended after Plenary Discussion, *Minutes of the Meetings*, *Aarhus*, p. 44.

[2] "God in Nature and History," *New Directions in Faith and Order*, p. 7.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 13.

[4] *Loc*. *cit*.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 15.

[6] *Loc*. *cit*.

---

[1] Loc. cit.

[2] Ibid. p. 28.

[3] Loc. cit.

XUM

progress may be viewed as signs foreshadowing the renewal of creation in the consummation. Yet these have been and can be used as instruments of violence and oppression by sinful man. The element of judgment cannot be absent from eschatology. There is no resurrection without the Cross preceding. Christians are called to share in the death as well as the resurrection of Christ. The document states: "We believe that the last secret of our world is the double secret of cross and resurrection."[1]

The eschatology revealed in this paper was considered to be deficient by some members of the Commission who believed that the end was viewed too exclusively under the view of consummation, and that the element of judgment was not adequately considered.[2] Opposition also was voiced that the paper did not view the Fall and sin as central to the history of man. These criticisms have also been levelled at Teilhard's theology as a whole.

The starting point of the paper was also criticized by others. In seeking a better relationship between the Christian message and the modern view of the world, the starting point was biblical history and the history of salvation. There were those who wanted a fundamentally different starting point, taking the anxieties and hopes of modern man seeking his lost place in creation as a starting point.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 29.

[2] "Discussion of the paper, 'God in Nature and History,'" cf. remarks of Fr. Florovsky and Professors Schlink and Wingren, ibid., p. 91.

iii. The Direction of the Future

Rev. D. T. Niles set an eschatological tone for the Uppsala Assembly in the opening sermon at the cathedral when he said, "the universality of the divine promise embraces nature as well as man; but it is eschatological... the complete transformation of all that already is...Otherwise its universality would lack the element of judgment."[1] Metropolitan Ignatios, in the Main Theme Address, stated that "the present structure of history is already a parousia - structure, in the proper theological sense of the Presence (parousia) of God-with-men."[2]

Dr. Visser't Hooft reminded the Assembly that Evanston made clear that eschatology must permeate the entire life of the Church, and by showing that Christian hope is productive helped to close the gap between the horizontalists and the verticalists. The Assembly, however, was predominantly occupied by the physical and moral ills that plagued mankind; the questions of war and peace, international responsibilities and social justice, revolution and race relations. Christians were urged to participate

---

[1] "To the Glory of God," The Uppsala Report, p. 99.

[2] Metropolitan Ignatios Hazim of Latakia, "Main Theme Address," The Uppsala Report, p. 297.

XUM

in the struggle of nations and peoples for development and justice. The emphasis was on the vertical. Dr. Berkhof pointed out in his address on the Finality of Christ that two points of view have faced one another since the beginning of the ecumenical movement. "The one has said: 'God's future will come through our efforts.' The other has said, 'God's future will come from above, entirely as his deed.'"[1]

In questioning whether this contrast was relevant, he said, "God and man are not rivals."[2] But the present world situation revealed that man and man are often rivals, and if man is not renewed and cannot recognize the coming King in the poor, the disenfranchised, the suffering and the hungry of the world, then the Kingdom is not hastened.

In speaking of this perennial issue of Church and World, Dr. Visser't Hooft stated to the Assembly that the debate is never closed and the churches "can only continue to live with the issue and struggle with it."[3] After the Assembly, Bishop Newbigin wrote that without a true eschatology which recognizes the need of judgment and conversion, and yet acknowledges that God is at work within and without the Church, "both evangelism and social action

---

[1] Hendrikus Berkhof, "The Finality of Jesus Christ," ibid., p. 312.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] Willem A. Visser't Hooft, "The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement," ibid., p. 316.

XUM

are robbed of the dimension of grace, and the search for the visible unity of the Church becomes an irrelevance."[1] The question raised by the Faith and Order Commission at Bristol can help the churches to discover the deeper dimensions and implications of eschatology.

iv. Christian in the World

In the editorial prefacing the official report of the Uppsala Assembly, Norman Goodall, in offering his personal assessment of the thrust of the conference, stated that the Assembly was preoccupied with "questions of social and economic justice, with the pressing, agonizing physical needs of men"[2] as well as questions of war and peace and a responsible society. According to Goodall, it was not only a preoccupation, but "at times, almost, its obsession..."[3] Not only was the world writing the agenda, but the world's right to do this was practically taken for granted as the churches attempted to read the message and respond to it. It was impossible to deny that a rapidly changing world called for involvement and action by the churches capable of meeting the world's needs.

Reacting to criticism that such social, economic and political involvement was causing the churches to stray from their role in proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ, promising the forgiveness of sin and eternal salvation, Dr. Blake, in his report to the Assembly said: "I want to be sure that this Assembly understands that this kind of activity has always been the proper business of the Church."[1] He pointed to the fact that the pioneer ecumenists were totally involved in the political, social and economic implications of the Gospel and that "Unity and service and mission all arise from the same source."[2] In making such a claim, Dr. Blake was on solid, historical ground because Lausanne already claimed that the Gospel is "the sure source of power for social regeneration,"[3] and the place where the Church "meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern world."[4] Dr. Visser't Hooft, fifty years later, recognizing that the ecumenical movement is being seriously questioned, can say "once again the basic issue is that of the relation between the Church and the world,"[5] between the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the Christian faith."[1]

---

[1] Lesslie Newbigin, "Which Way for Faith and Order?", What Unity Implies, p. 119.

[2] Norman Goodall, "Editorial," The Uppsala Report, p. xvii.

[3] Loc. cit.

---

[1] "The Report of the General Secretary," Appendix II, ibid., p. 287.

[2] Ibid., p. 289.

[3] "The Church's Message to the World - the Gospel," Report of Section Two, Faith and Order Proceedings, Lausanne, p. 462.

[4] Ibid., p. 463.

[5] W. A. Visser't Hooft, "The Mandate of the Ecumenical Movement, Appendix V, The Uppsala Report, p. 316.

The Amsterdam Assembly, in calling for a deeper understanding of the differences which divide the churches, listed as an area of disagreement "the nature of the Church's responsibility for the common life of men and their temporal institutions."[2] Following upon the Second World War and the fragmentation brought about by it, the preoccupation of the churches with the unity of the Church in the face of the world broken and torn and in need of reconciliation must have seemed to many extremely narrow and completely irrelevant. This feeling could only draw re-inforcement from the statement that the churches could agree upon the fact that "the Church is God's gift to men for the salvation of the world."[3] This universal view continues to be the view of the churches engaged in the search for unity and continues to be a matter of contention. At Amsterdam, Kraemer set forth the problem by asking: "Is religion relatedness to a world of transcendental realities and values a necessary part of human life, or is it an antiquated stage in the evolution of the race?"[4] His response

---

[1] Ibid., p. 317.

[2] "The Universal Church in God's Design," Report of Section One. Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. I., p. 207.

[3] Ibid., p. 206.

[4] Hendrik Kraemer, "A World Task," The Church's Witness to God's Design, (Man's Disorder and God's Design, Vol. II), p. 15.

XUM

was that "the whole Church is responsible for the whole world,"[1] and that the proper point of orientation for the Church's activity is "the identification of the Church with God's solicitude for the world."[2]

Lund saw "new calls and opportunities to hear the unifying Word of God,"[3] in attending to the problems and needs of the modern world inundated by new scientific and technological discoveries. The conference delegates stated that "scientific investigation of the physical universe has opened up new and vast horizons and most of our divisions antedate these great changes in our knowledge,"[4] recognizing that while this in no way affects the faith of the Church, it does affect the way the churches present their convictions to each other.

(1) Responsibility to Society

The selection of Christian hope as the theme for the Evanston Assembly brought the churches together to discuss more particularly the signs of hope in the world and the concept of a responsible society. The Report of Section Three states that "The churches have come to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] Ibid., p. 18.

[3] "Continuity and Unity," Section III, "The Report to the Churches," The Third World Conference on Faith and Order, p. 34.

[4] "Where Do We Stand?", Section Six, "The Report to the Churches," ibid., p. 62.

XUM

realize more fully that they have a duty to society as part of their mission in the world."[1] Yet the lack of specificity disturbed a number of the delegates in regard to specific reference to signs of hope.

In speaking of the Christian in his vocation, the Report of the Laity acknowledged that since Amsterdam the churches have made rapid strides in awakening a sense of responsibility in the layman. In the words of the report, it is the lay people in the Church who "draw together work and worship."[2] The theme of work "has not received from the churches the attention it deserves,"[3] and people today wonder whether their faith has any relevance to their daily work. There is a "gulf between the Church and its worship and their workaday lives."[4] For Evanston this gulf can be overcome by a Christian view of work, and the meaning of a Christian vocation in secular affairs is for every layman "to witness to the reality of this new creation, that is, to the redemptive work of Christ, in all his work and words and life."[5] It is the eschatological viewpoint which gives value to man's work in the world. "Regarded solely from the standpoint of this world, the work which men do is of transient worth,"[1] but "regarded from the standpoint of hope in the coming Kingdom of Christ," acts in conformity with God's laws have "abiding significance and worth."[2]

---

[1] "Social Questions: the Responsible Society in a World Perspective," Report of Section Three, The Evanston Report, p. 113.

[2] "The Laity: the Christian in His Vocation," Report of Section Six, ibid., p. 161.

[3] Ibid., p. 162.

[4] Loc. cit.

[5] Ibid., p. 165.

The Report of the Section on Service at New Delhi drew attention to the technological and social changes in the modern world, changes so spectacular that many people now place their hope in science and technology, and warned that service and technology can be salvific or demonic, depending upon the use and the user. But for the delegates the correct attitude is that "the Christian should welcome scientific discoveries as new steps in man's dominion over nature."[3] There should be no fear of scientific or technological discoveries, but there should be grave concern about their application. Man should grow in knowledge and master nature for mankind's benefit and God's glory. The report touched upon the sociological patterns in the modern world and the public issues in regard to racial problems, nuclear disarmaments, scientific and technological challenges, and singled out possibilities for Christians to give service to the modern world.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 167.

[2] Loc. cit.

[3] "Service," in "Reports of the Sections," The New Delhi Report, p. 24.

(2) World Conference on Church and Society

The impact of science and technology on society, and the response of Christians to such a society was the subject matter for investigations at the World Conference on Church and Society held in July of 1966 in Geneva. The topic of the discussion was "Christians in the Technical and Social Revolutions of Our Time," approved by the Central Committee in 1962.[1] Throughout the Conference the attention of the delegates was concentrated on the four issues of modern technology, the need for development, world peace and political and social justice[2] as they tried to reformulate the relation between the Church and the modern world.

Neither common understanding of the problems themselves nor their solutions were readily available. Consensus on specific issues did not follow simply from the fact that Christian faith offers a common foundation and objectives for service to society. The conditions of the modern world make cooperation and unity a Christian imperative. The affirmation of the Central Committee that

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Central Committee, *Minutes and Reports of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Central Committee, Paris*, 1962, pp. 64-65.

[2] "The Message of the Conference," *World Conference on Church and Society, Geneva*, 1966, p. 26.

XUM

"the Church confirms mankind in its responsible domination over the earth through technology,"[1] was not greatly disputed but difficult to concretize. There was a call to man to exercise responsible stewardship, and the reminder that "man's sense of stewardship for God's creation must expand with his expanding powers..."[2] In discussing the theological issues involved in such a call the eschatological aspect was evident, as the working group stated that when time was fulfilled "all nature, all the forces of human society, and human life itself will be transformed."[3] This transformation "often happens as a result of actions that had quite other motives."[4] This calls upon Christians to labor "to transform human society at every point in the hope that God will use their work for good whether they succeed or fail.[5]

It was with these concerns uppermost in their minds that the delegates met at Uppsala. There was no evidence of a simple split between the social gospel and the gospel of personal salvation. There was, in fact, "the almost universal recognition that the Church belongs to the world of action."[1] The always widening gap between rich nations and poor nations, the destructions of war, assassinations and revolts, the many victims of injustice and discrimination, all these witnessed to the demonic in society and the need for a world-wide community. There was no doubt that concern for human needs and deprivations must demand a re-ordering of the priorities of Christians. The churches responded to the need of alleviating human suffering but the question still remained as to how there is anything specifically Christian in this humanitarian concern. That the connection between activity and holiness is not yet clear can be seen from the fear raised by Bishop Sarkissian: "Would being involved in the world's concerns and the needs of men mean a shift away from Christ as the center."[2] In discussing the Report on Mission, Dr. John Taylor isolated the main issue as "the apparent opposition between the gospel of personal conversion and the gospel of social responsibility,"[3] an issue which demands synthesis not compromise. And H. Berkhof, assessing the results of the Assembly believes that such a synthesis is still lacking

---

[1] World Council of Churches, Central Committee, _Minutes of the Central Committee Meeting, Rochester, 1963_. (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1963), p. 105.

[2] "Man and Community in Changing Societies," The Report of Section Four, _World Conference on Church and Society, Geneva, 1966_, p. 155.

[3] "Reports of the Working Groups," _ibid_., p. 201.

[4] _Loc. cit._

[5] _Loc. cit._

---

[1] Norman Goodall, "Editorial," The Uppsala Report, p. xviii.

[2] Minutes of the Commission and Working Committee, Sigtuna, 1968. (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968), p. 15.

[3] "Renewal in Mission," Report of Section Two, The Uppsala Report, p. 24.

XUM

as "we were not able to present our concern for human development convincingly or in the context of a wider understanding of the Gospel."[1]

5. Summary

i. Question Facing Faith and Order

The rise of science and technology, the concern of the Churches for the world's development and the renewed emphasis on eschatology, all highlight the many problems inherent in the struggle of the Church to find its relationship to the modern world. It is the role of the Christian in the world which commanded the lion's share of attention at Uppsala as the world provided the agenda, and which still faces the Churches as they relate the unity of the Church to the unity of mankind. The question before the Churches was brought out at Bristol: "How, for example, are contemporary movements in pursuit of peace, social justice and human equality to be evaluated in terms of Christian love and related to the hope of unity in Christ without, on the one hand, a false identification of the Gospel with secularist goals, or, on the other, a disengagement of Christians from the world's concerns or from dialogue with non-Christian religious insights and the aspira-

---

[1] Hendrikus Berkhof, "Re-opening the Dialogue with the "Horizontalists", The Ecumenical Review, Vol. XXI (October, 1969), p. 289.

XUM

tions of secular man?"[1] The issue remains the basic one. It is the relation between the Church and the world, between the horizontal and the vertical dimensions of faith. And it could be said that Teilhard devoted his life's work to grappling with this question.

ii. Teilhard's Contribution

It was Teilhard's consistent belief that a view of Christianity which negated the world or was sparing of human hopes was a false view. The modern world had engendered a faith in science and in the world's potentialities and Teilhard felt that Christianity must respond to this impulse in man and assimilate it. It must give man a love of God's creation and a motive force to develop the world to its capacity. Teilhard stressed the union of Christ with the universe through his Incarnation and looked, then, for the completion of the world in Christ. His view was eschatological, embracing a Christ who was intrinsic to the world's completion and who, through his Incarnation, gave a divine dimension to matter and to man's work. The world is unfinished and man, with Christ, is to bring it to completion. Man could not abandon the world in the name of Christianity but conversely must develop a

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church," Report of Section One, in New Directions in Faith and Order, Appendix III, p. 132.

"gospel of human conquest."[1] This is to develop the world in the light of the Incarnation. By virtue of the Incarnation nothing is profane to those who have faith, and it is the consummation of all things in Christ brought about by his grace which would prohibit a false identification of the Gospel with the goals of secularists. The goal of history is union with a Personal Being.

It is this unitive view of Teilhard, dealing with the world from creation to consummation, that gives it appeal. Faith in God and faith in the world complement and reveal one another. He saw Christian hope as productive. The end of Christian hope is the Second Coming of Christ, a coming prepared for through the creative efforts of man.

It was Teilhard's conviction that "the great schism that threatens the Church is that 'Christian' and 'human' no longer tend to coincide."[2] It was his attempts to heal this schism that gave him an "openness to worldly values matched with an unconditional commitment to God"[3] and made him, in one theologian's opinion "perhaps the most forceful embodiment of Christian humanism since Friedrich

---

[1] Teilhard," Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World," in Science and Christ, p. 122.

[2] "Note pour servir á l'évangelisation des temps nouveaux" in La Parole Attendue, Cahiers IV, (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963), p. 13.

[3] Wildiers, An Introduction to Teilhard de Chardin, p. 151.

Schleiermacher."[1] In trying to close this breach Teilhard may have overemphasized the signs indicating the progress of man on earth by stressing Christ's ultimate victory. He may have blurred the edges between sacred and secular history by neglecting the discontinuous in history. Faith reveals nothing to man about the end of the world although it does tell us of God's plan for the human race. But in so doing he embraces temporal values and analyzes the cause of unbelief in the modern world. He reveals the inadequacy of positivist materialism by showing that a spiritual force is active in the world. God is the God of the Forward as well as the Above. Rideau sees the danger that Teilhard could overly diminish the existential and personal impact of the redemptive work of Christ. He says:

> In manifestly transferring the centre or summit of history towards the Parousia, Teilhard may have failed to find the necessary terms for expressing the dialectical tension of a history, which, though completed, nevertheless continues, for it manifests and accomplishes the progressive triumph of Christ in his mystical body.[2]

But he opened up new vistas which theologians can explore whose thrust and direction give vitality to religion and supply an incentive for humanism. He fashioned a congruity between man and the world and closes the gap between the Church and the modern world. Evolution brought to the

---

[1] Hefner, The Promise of Teilhard, p. 87.

[2] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 168.

XUM

Christian thinker the problem of the end of history and the communion of God and man. With the Incarnation there entered the notion of a fulness which is to be completed, an already and a not yet, and Teilhard articulated this problem strongly and brought great insights to it. He explored the concept of Christ as the goal and head of all creation even in the order of nature and it proved to be of an extraordinary richness. It allowed him, in an evolutionary context, to try "to raise up the great cathedral of a universal humanism, whose vast nave would hold the whole of sacred and secular history...whose valuting would meet in the Keystone who is Christ."[1] He followed the "instinctive persistence of human thought in seeking to reduce the world to unity,"[2] and saw Christ in the Church as the great instrument of such a unity. His purpose was to set theologians on a course which would allow for traditional Christian belief to be coupled with an openness to science in order to reveal the presence of God in the world.

> His theories of creation, evil, God-Forward and God-Above and the cosmic Christ were not only ahead of his own generation, but they still stand as markers for what is largely unexplored territory for theologians today.[3]

---

[1] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 253.

[2] "Centrology," in The Activation of Energy, p. 99.

[3] Hefner, The Promise of Teilhard, p. 116.

The theologians of the Faith and Order movement are presently concerned with exploring a part of this territory and the work of Teilhard can be beneficial to this effort.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

There is little doubt that the concern for unity evident in the work of Teilhard de Chardin is paralleled in the present work of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. Sharing both an evolutionary perspective and an eschatological emphasis, the theology of Teilhard and that of Faith and Order today can work together to fashion a more comprehensive understanding of the mysteries of Christian faith.

From the very beginning of his theological writings, Teilhard has been concerned with the questions presently facing Faith and Order and has responded to them from his own background of science and faith. Like Faith and Order, he early questioned a theology which would produce a spirituality divorcing the earth from its possibilities. He accepted the unity of the Church and its role in unifying mankind. He attempted to come to grips with the perennial problem of the "horizontal" and the "vertical" aspects of Christianity in order to bring the world to fulfilment through the redeeming grace of God. He asked and probed many of the questions presently facing Faith and Order. Before the call of Faith and Order for a radical revision of theological language and a reformulation of the central

XUM

doctrines of Christianity, Teilhard was at work in these areas. It is this, it seems that can account in part for his popularity, his condemnation, and his influence on certain Faith and Order studies.

Theologians have both commended and criticized Teilhard for his manifest humanism, his attempt to heal and breach between science and religion, his novel and sometimes startling vocabulary, his evolutionary theology and many other aspects of his thought. Faith and Order has received its share of such commendation and criticism also. But neither can be faulted for the attempt to make Christ central to the world's progress.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of Teilhard to a theology which speaks to the aspirations of the modern world is his acceptance of the Scotistic view of the Incarnation and its development in an evolutionary framework. By embracing this view, he calls the Christian to his responsibility for the world's development and redemption. He shifts the emphasis from creation to eschatology which provides a motive force for involvement in the world but raises the problem of the communion of God and man at the end of history. This view of the Incarnation is receiving increased attention in Faith and Order studies and provides exciting possibilities for a Christocentric theology. Development along this line could add fresh vitality to the theology of Faith and Order and facilitate understanding of the perennial problem of Gospel and Secular.

The problem of the communion of God and man at the end of history becomes more acute when viewed in a universe in evolution. It was to Teilhard's credit that he attempted to respond to this problem and articulated it forcefully, inducing other theologians to explore it also. At the present time it is occupying the attention of Faith and Order theologians as they probe the meaning of God in nature and in history. This eschatological perspective can be extremely valuable to the Churches as they pursue Church unity since it easily lends itself to dialogue and places the emphasis on what lies ahead and not on past differences. It reminds the Churches that "the holy task of reconciling all Christians in the one and only Church of Christ transcends human energies and abilities," urging them to "go forward without obstructing the ways of divine Providence and without prejudging the future inspiration of the Holy Spirit."[1]

While Teilhard can re-inforce the eschatological emphasis among the Churches seeking unity and urge them to their task in the world as part of this emphasis, still the criticisms of his works must be examined. The Church is always challenged by the antinomy of the continuous and the discontinuous. There is always the temptation to

---

[1] "Decree on Ecumenism," in Documents of Vatican II, pp. 365-366.

XUM

exaggerate the signs of progress. The charge that Teilhard "over-emphasized the image of a temporal term lying ahead at the expense of the eternal present of a spiritual event that is going on in the hidden places of God"[1] is shared by a number of theologians. It is a deficiency which jeopardized his entire system of thought. So Faith and Order theologians who support the theological direction given in the document, "God in Nature and History," a document which can be called Teilhardian, would do well to take seriously the criticisms leveled against it by other Faith and Order theologians: the charges of deficient eschatology, failure to do justice to the specific in man, neglect of the Fall and sin as central events in man's history, and an insufficient emphasis on the affirmations of the New Testament about separation and judgment.[2] For these same criticisms were raised against Teilhard's theology and brought to light serious problems needing further clarification. Teilhard's theology stressed the continuities between man and the world and between God and man. Perhaps the source of its great appeal can be located in its exaltation of man and the world through the Incarnation of Christ, an exaltation that gives man hope and assures ultimate victory through the Resurrection. But the existence of sin, loss and alienation is just as real. Man may be exalted, but he is also in need of mercy and forgiveness. The minority report given at Bristol rightly warns that "we cannot deny the reality of evil...the given unities of life are disrupted."[1] Perhaps the modern temper is more alive to the exaltation of man and the possibilities of society than ever before, but who can deny the clear existence of the abiding perversity of man and the cumulative inheritance of evil. It may vitalize Christianity to stress creation and view the Cross as a symbol of progress, but if it is not seen as a pardon and a return to grace, then a precious balance is lost.

---

[1] Rideau, The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin, p. 185.

[2] Discussion of the paper, "God in Nature and History," in New Directions in Faith and Order, pp. 88-92.

Both Teilhard and Faith and Order accept a trinitarian basis for their theological speculation but the extreme Incarnationalism of Teilhard can find its counterpart in the charge of Christomonism made against Faith and Order. The delegates at Lund recommended that the Church be studied in close relation to Christology and pneumatology. The Uppsala Assembly in responding to this recommendation revealed the sharp criticisms of the Orthodox delegates to the report on the Holy Spirit and the catholicity of the Church and manifested the divergent views of Western and Eastern Christians. In some respects the Romans, Anglicans and Protestants appear closer to one another than to the Orthodox Christians of the East.[1]

---

[1] "Creation, New Creation and the Unity of the Church," ibid., p. 136.

One of the most promising aspects of Teilhard's thought is the influence of the Greek Fathers, especially Irenaeus and Gregory of Nyssa on his theology. It profoundly affects his understanding of the Incarnation and grace. It would seem more than profitable for those engaged in examining Christ as the agent of creation to do so recognizing the effect of the Greek Fathers on Teilhard's thought. It is a point in Teilhard's theology which needs to be completed.

The strong concern of Teilhard to explore the cosmic implications of the Risen Christ as expressed in John, Ephesians and Colossians calls for an equally strong concern for the work of the Holy Spirit in creation. These are important texts, to be sure, and texts which, perhaps, have been unduly neglected. But one would have to ask whether these are the most fundamental passages in the Scriptures, and would have to cite, in Teilhard, a serious neglect of other Scriptural passages. In choosing the view of Duns Scotus over that of Thomas Aquinas the authors of the report, "God in Nature and History" do so because it gives the most satisfactory explanation of John I, Colossians I and Hebrews I, which deal with Jesus Christ as the agent of creation.[1] This concentration on Christ as the agent of creation also requires the balance of a pneumatology which perhaps could speak to the Fall and sin, separation and judgment and the reconciliation of man with God. Pneumatology would add a needed corrective to both Teilhard and Faith and Order, and lessen the dangers of a generalized Christology which would neglect the aspect of God's mercy and forgiveness.

---

[1] John Weller, Personal Comment on the Work of the Section on the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church, in The Uppsala Report, p. 19.

Teilhard proposed a Christian spirituality and a Christian humanism which offers fulfilment to the person, and offers it not in some future life but here and now. The ideal of being fully human and personal finds a responsive chord in the heart of modern man. Its importance is found reflected both in Faith and Order and the theology of Vatican II. It is, for Teilhard, an ideal totally dependent on growth in love. And he believed that Christianity is the locus where this has been realized and continues to be realized. The Christ which Teilhard presents is not only a model of a life fully human, but is also a source and direction of history. Christianity, therefore, would not be faithful to its mandate and mission if it did not reach out to all those who have responsibility for the economic, political, cultural, and scientific development of society which can unite man and foster his true

---

[1] "God in Nature and History," in New Directions in Faith and Order, p. 13.

XUM

development. Teilhard views the advance of secular culture as one stage in man's coming of age and his liberation. It is Christianity's task to quicken the human enterprise.

The attitude of Christian humanism is defined by Teilhard as one which embraces progress in the world and faith in God in a unitary act which increases personalization. It is the combination of the Above and the Ahead that transforms man into a creative collaborator in the world's progress, a progress which effects his salvation while building the earth and awaiting the reign of God. This view is reflected in the present work of Faith and Order, especially evident at Uppsala where the theologians continued to struggle with the relation of Church and World, the horizontal and the vertical and personal salvation and social responsibility.

The implications of the theological concepts treated in this study have been but lightly touched upon. By pointing out common problems studied in a context influenced by eschatology and evolution, and by indicating a direction for further exploration, a dialectic can ensue to further the cause of Church unity. The unified vision of Teilhard, set in its dynamic framework, can offer valuable insights to Faith and Order theologians. In addition, it can provide a direction in which they might profitably pursue further study of God's work in creation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. WORKS OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

(Note: Only works cited in this study are included here.)

A. Books and Articles

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. Activation of Energy. Translated by René Hague. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970.

Centrology, pp. 97-125.

Outline of a Dialectic of Spirit, pp. 141-152.

Reflections on the Scientific Probability and the Religious Consequences of an Ultra-Human, pp. 269-280.

The Stuff of the Universe, pp. 373-384.

The Zest for Living, pp. 229-244.

________. The Appearance of Man. Translated by J. M. Cohen. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

The Phyletic Structure of the Human Group, pp. 132-171.

________. Christianity and Evolution. Translated by René Hague. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

Christ the Evolver, pp. 138-150.

The Christian Phenomenon, pp. 199-208.

Christianity and Evolution: Suggestions for a New Theology, pp. 173-186.

Christology and Evolution, pp. 76-95.

The Contingence of the Universe and Man's Zest for Survival, pp. 221-228.

How I believe, pp. 96-132.

Introduction to the Christian Life, pp. 151-172.

XUM

Note on the Physical Union Between the Humanity of Christ and the Faithful in the Course of Their Sanctification, pp. 15-20.

On the Notion of Creative Transformation, pp. 21-24.

Pantheism and Christianity, pp. 56-75.

Reflections on Original Sin, pp. 187-198.

Some General Views on the Essence of Christianity, pp. 133-137.

What the World is Looking for from the Church of God at this Moment, pp. 212-220.

________. *Comment Je Crois*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1969.

Ce que le Monde attend de l'Église de Dieu, pp. 251-262.

Chute, Rédemption et Géocentrie, pp. 47-58.

Le Christ évoluteur, pp. 161-176.

Christianisme et Évolution, pp. 201-216.

Christologie et Évolution, pp. 93-114.

Comment je crois, pp. 115-152.

Introduction à la Vie chrétienne, pp. 177-200.

Note sur quelques Représentations historiques possibles du Péché originel, pp. 59-70.

Panthéisme et Christianisme, pp. 71-92.

Quelques Vues générales sur l'Essence du Christianisme, pp. 153-160.

Réflexions sur le Péché originel, pp. 217-230.

________. *The Divine Milieu*. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

________. *The Future of Man*. Translated by Norman Denny. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

The Directions and Conditions of the Future, pp. 227-237.

XUM

Does Mankind Move Biologically upon Itself?, pp. 244-259.

The End of the Species, pp. 298-305.

Faith in Man, pp. 185-192.

Faith in Peace, pp. 149-154.

The Formation of the Noosphere, pp. 155-184.

The Grand Option, pp. 37-60.

A Great Event Foreshadowed: The Planetisation of Mankind, pp. 124-139.

The Heart of the Problem, pp. 260-269.

How may we Conceive and Hope that Human Unanimisation will be Realised on Earth? pp. 281-288.

Life and the Planets, pp. 97-123.

The New Spirit, 1942, pp. 82-96.

A Note on Progress, pp. 11-24.

On the Probable Coming of an 'Ultra-Humanity', pp. 270-280.

Social Heredity and Progress, pp. 25-36.

Some Reflections on Progress, pp. 61-81.

Turmoil or Genesis?, pp. 214-226.

________. Human Energy. Translated by J. M. Cohen. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969.

Human Energy, pp. 113-162.

The Mysticism of Science, pp. 163-182.

The Significance and Positive Value of Suffering, pp. 48-52.

Sketch of a Personalistic Universe, pp. 53-92.

________. Hymn of the Universe. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Christ in the World of Matter, pp. 42-55.

XUM

The Mass on the World, pp. 13-37.

The Spiritual Power of Matter, pp. 59-71.

________. "La Parole Attendue." *Cahier IV*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963.

________. *The Phenomenon of Man.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

________. "Réflexions Sur Le Bonheur." *Cahier II*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1960.

________. *Science and Christ*. Translated by René Hague. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Action and Activation, pp. 174-186.

Catholicism and Science, pp. 187-191.

Christianity in the World, pp. 98-112.

Ecumenism, pp. 197-198.

Modern Unbelief, pp. 113-117.

My Universe, pp. 37-85.

Note on the Universal Christ, pp. 14-20.

The Religious Value of Research, pp. 199-205.

Science and Christ or Analysis and Synthesis, pp. 21-36.

Some Reflexions on the Conversion of the World, pp. 118-127.

Super-Humanity, Super-Christ, Super-Charity, pp. 151-173.

________. *The Vision of the Past*. Translated by J. M. Cohen. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Evolution of the Idea of Evolution, pp. 245-247.

Hominization, pp. 51-79.

Man's Place in Nature, pp. 175-182.

Man's Place in the Universe, pp. 216-233.

XUM

The Transformist Paradox, pp. 80-102.

________. *Writings in Time of War*. Translated by René Hague. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Cosmic Life, pp. 13-72.

Creative Union, pp. 151-176.

Forma Christi, pp. 249-270.

The Priest, pp. 203-224.

The Soul of the World, pp. 177-190.

The Universal Element, pp. 289-302.

B. Letters

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. *Letters From A Traveller*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

________. *Letters to Léontine Zanta*. Translated by Bernard Wall, New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

C. Unpublished Materials

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. *Le Christique*. New York: Library of the Teilhard de Chardin Association, 1955.

________. *La Coeur de la Matière*. New York: Library of the Teilhard de Chardin Association, 1951.

________. *Comment Je Vois*. New York: Library of the Teilhard de Chardin Association, 1948.

________. *Trois Choses que Je Vois*. New York: Library of the Teilhard de Chardin Association, 1948.

II. WORKS ON THE THOUGHT OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

A. Books

Crespy, Georges. *From Science to Theology*. Translated by George Shriver. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

Cuénot, Claude. *Teilhard de Chardin*. A Biographical Study. Translated by Vincent Colimore. Baltimore: Helicon, 1965.

XUM

Dyson, A. O. "Pierre Teilhard de Chardin." A Dictionary of Christian Theology. Edited by Alan Richardson. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1969.

Faricy, Robert L. Teilhard de Chardin's Theology of the Christian in the World. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.

Hanson, Anthony. Teilhard Reassessed. London: Dalton, Longman and Todd, 1970.

Hefner, Philip. The Promise of Teilhard. New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1970.

Kessler, Marvin and Bernard Brown, eds. Dimensions of the Future. The spirituality of Teilhard de Chardin. Washington: Corpus Books, 1968.

Kraft, Ralph Wayne. The Relevance of Teilhard. Fides Publishers, Inc. Notre Dame, Indiana, 1968.

Lubac, Henri de. Teilhard de Chardin: The Man and His Meaning. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1965.

________. The Religion of Teilhard de Chardin. Translated by René Hague. Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1967.

Mooney, Christopher. Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Murray, Michael H. The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin. An introduction. New York: Seabury, 1966.

Rideau, Emile. The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin. Translated by René Hague. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Smulders, Pieter F. The Design of Teilhard de Chardin. An essay in theological reflection. Westminster: Newman, 1967.

Towers, Bernard. Teilhard de Chardin. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.

Tresmontant, Claude. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: His Thought. Baltimore: Helicon, 1959.

Wildiers, N. M. An Introduction to Teilhard de Chardin. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

XUM

B. Periodicals

Berry, Thomas, C.P. "The Threshold of the Modern World." *Proceedings of the Teilhard Conference 1964*. New York: Human Energetics Research Institute, 1964, pp. 57-70.

Congregation of the Holy Office. "Monitum on the Writings of Teilhard de Chardin." Latin Text. *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXLVII (August, 1962), 134.

Donnelly, W. "The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin." *Clergy Review*, XLV (June, 1960), 324-49.

Faricy, R. "Teilhard de Chardin: a critical survey." *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIX (October, 1968), 261-69.

McMahon, J. "What Does Christianity Add to Atheistic Humanism?" *Cross Currents*, XVIII (September, 1968), 129-50.

Russell, J. L. "Teilhard de Chardin: The Phenomenon of Man." *Heythrop Journal*, I (October, 1960), 271-84.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre. "La Pensee du Pene Teilhard de Chardin." *Les Etudes Philosophiques*, X (1955), 569-71.

III. FAITH AND ORDER PROCEEDINGS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Gardiner, Robert H. Subjects Committee Papers. Circulated in preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order. Gardiner, Maine: By the Author, 1923.

Bate, H. N., ed. *Faith and Order. Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927*. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1928.

Woods, Edward Sydney. *Lausanne, 1927*. London: S.C.M. Press, 1927.

Faith and Order Continuation Committee. *Programme for the Second World Conference on Faith and Order*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.

Hodgson, Leonard, ed. *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

XUM

World Conference on Faith and Order Continuation Committee. *Continuation Committee Report*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1948.

Tomkins, Oliver S., ed. *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order*. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1953.

World Council of Churches. Commission on Faith and Order. *Minutes of the Commission and Working Committee*. Evanston and Chicago, 1954. Paper No. 21. Lausanne: La Concorde, 1954.

Rodger, P. C. and Vischer, Lukas, eds. *The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order*. New York: Association Press, 1964.

World Council of Churches. Commission on Faith and Order. *Minutes of the Working Committee*. Paper No. 26. Geneva: La Concorde, 1958.

________. *Minutes of the Commission and Working Committee*. Montreal, 1963. Paper No. 41. Lausanne: La Concorde, 1963.

________. *Minutes of the Meetings of the Faith and Order Commission and Working Committee*. Aarhus, 1964. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1965.

________. *New Directions in Faith and Order*. Bristol, 1967. Faith and Order Paper No. 50. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968.

________. *Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission and Working Committee*, 1968. Uppsala and Sigtuna. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968.

IV. WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES' ASSEMBLIES AND RELATED DOCUMENTS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

World Council of Churches. *Man's Disorder and God's Design*. The Amsterdam Assembly Series. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

World Council of Churches. Central Committee. *Minutes and Reports of the Third Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. Toronto, Canada, July 9-15, 1950*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, n.d.

XUM

________. *Minutes and Reports of the Fourth Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. Rolle, Switzerland, August 4-11, 1951*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, n.d.

World Council of Churches. "The Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme of the Second Assembly." *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

World Council of Churches. "The Statement on the Report of the Advisory Committee." *The Evanston Report*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

Visser't Hooft, W. A., ed. *The Evanston Report*. The Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

World Council of Churches. Central Committee. *Minutes and Reports of the Eighth Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. Davos, Switzerland, August 2-8, 1955*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, n.d.

________. *Minutes of the Central Committee. Paris, 1962*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1962.

Visser't Hooft, W. A., ed. *The New Delhi Report. The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches*. New York: Association Press, 1962.

World Council of Churches. Central Committee. *Central Committee Minutes. Rochester, 1963*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1963.

World Council of Churches. *New Delhi to Uppsala, 1961-1968, Report of the Central Committee to the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968.

Goodall, Norman, ed. *The Uppsala Report 1968. Official Report of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968.

Vischer, Lukas, ed. *A Documentary History of the Faith and Order Movement, 1927-1963*. St. Louis, Missouri: The Bethany Press, 1963.

Visser't Hooft, Willem Adolph. *No Other Name*. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1963.

XUM

V. MATERIALS RELATING TO FAITH AND ORDER AND WORLD COUNCIL ASSEMBLIES

A. Books

Allmen, Jean-Jacques von. *The Lord's Supper*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1969.

Baillie, Donald and Marsh, John, eds. *Inter-Communion*. London: S.C.M. Press, 1952.

Edwall, Pehr; Hayman, Eric; and Maxwell, William D., eds. "The Report of the Commission," in *Ways of Worship*. London: S.C.M. Press, 1951.

Flew, R. Newton, ed. *The Nature of the Church*. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1952.

Gaines, David P. *The World Council of Churches*. Peterborough, N. H.: Richard R. Smith, 1966.

Hodgson, Leonard, ed. *Convictions*. London: S.C.M. Press, 1934.

Kennedy, James W. *No Darkness at All*. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1962.

Marsh, John. *The Significance of Evanston*. London: Independent Press, Ltd., 1954.

Minear, Paul, ed. *Faith and Order Findings. The Final Report of the Theological Commission to the Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order, Montreal, 1963*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963.

Nelson, J. Robert. "The Unity of the Church and the Unity of Mankind." *What Unity Implies, Six Essays After Uppsala*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1969.

Northcott, Cecil. *Evanston World Assembly*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1954.

Skoglund, John E. and Nelson, J. Robert. *Fifty Years of Faith and Order*. New York: Committee for the Interseminary Movement of the National Student Christian Federation, 1963.

Slack, Kenneth. *Uppsala Report. The Story of the World Council of Churches, Fourth Assembly, Uppsala, Sweden*. London: S.C.M. Press, 1968.

XUM

Weigel, Gustave. "Catholic Ecclesiology in Our Time." *Christianity Divided*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.

World Council of Churches. *Christians in the Technical and Social Revolutions of Our Time*. The Official Report of the World Conference on Church and Society. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1967.

________. *Councils and the Ecumenical Movement*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1968.

________. *Response to Evanston*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1955.

________. *The Ten Formative Years*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1948.

B. Periodicals

Berkhof, Hendrikus. "Re-opening the Dialogue with the Horizontalists." *The Ecumenical Review*, XXI, No. 4 (October, 1969), 289-98.

Blake, Eugene C. "The Report of the General Secretary." *The Ecumenical Review*, XXI (October, 1969), 332-40.

Heuvel van den, Albert H. "Survey of Press Comments, Reactions to the Fourth Assembly." *The Ecumenical Review*, XXI, No. 1 (January, 1969), 32-54.

Nelson, J. Robert. "Toward an Ecumenical Ecclesiology." *Theological Studies*, XXXI, No. 4 (December, 1970), 644-673.

Vischer, Lukas. "Questions on theEucharist, its past and future celebration." *Studia Liturgica*, V, No. 2 (Summer, 1966), 65-86.

World Council of Churches. Report of the Advisory Commission on the Main Theme of the Second Assembly "Christ - the Hope of the World." *The Ecumenical Review*, VI (October, 1953-September, 1954), 430-65.

________. "The Lordship of Christ Over the World and the Church." *The Ecumenical Review*, XI (Autumn, 1958-Summer, 1959), 437-449.

VI. GENERAL REFERENCES

Campion, Donald R. "Commentary on the Church in the Modern World." The Documents of Vatican II. Edited by Walter Abbott, S.J. New York: Guild Press, 1966.

Joannis Duns Scoti. Tomus Vigesimus Tertius. Parissis: Apud Ludovicum Vives, MDCCC XCIV.

Raymond, P. "Duns Scot." Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique. Edited by A. Vacant. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 1924.

Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologia. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1924.

XUM

VITA

James Richard Roach, son of John and Elizabeth Roach, was born on July 26, 1932, in Lynn, Massachusetts. He received his early education in Boston elementary schools and Boston College High School. After two years in the United States Navy he enrolled at Boston College where he was graduated in 1957 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Education. He spent a year teaching in Jamaica, West Indies, and then entered St. John's Seminary in Brighton, Mass. In 1963 he was ordained a priest of the Archdiocese of Boston. He was also granted the Certificate by the Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies of the Ecumenical Institute near Geneva, Switzerland for study in 1968-1969.

His pastoral experience includes a term as Associate Pastor of St. John's Church, Swampscott, Mass., 1963-1966. Presently he is Chaplain to the Catholic students at Salem State College, Salem, Mass. He has held the office of Vice-President of the Boston Senate of Priests, President of the New England Conference of Priests' Senates and was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention of the National Federation of Priests' Councils.

XUM